

932.5

P87

Columbia University
in the City of New York

LIBRARY



COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

This book is due on the date indicated below, or at the expiration of a definite period after the date of borrowing, as provided by the rules of the Library or by special arrangement with the Librarian in charge.



A

HISTORY
OF
THE JESUITS;

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED

A Reply

TO

MR. DALLAS's DEFENCE

OF

THAT ORDER.

“Ταῦτα πανθ’ ὑπερ Υμῶν, ὑπερ της Αληθείας, ὑπερ της ὑμετέρας Πολιτείας,
καὶ των Νομών, καὶ της Σωτηρίας, καὶ της Ευσεβίας, καὶ της Δοξῆς, καὶ
της Ελευθερίας, ὑπερ των κοινῆ πασι Συμφερούτων ακριβολογύματι καὶ
διεξερχοματι.”—DEMOSTHENES.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR BALDWIN, CRADOCK, AND JOY,
PATERNOSTER ROW.

1816.

932.5
P87

1

TO THE
RIGHT HONOURABLE
CHARLES ABBOT,

SPEAKER

OF THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS,

&c. &c. &c

SIR,

IN presuming to dedicate to you the following pages, I would observe, that, while the improved taste of the present age has happily relieved those who occupy eminent stations from the extravagance of unmeasured panegyric, which was once too frequently employed on such occasions, there is something yet due to Truth from any writer who may present his work to such a character as I have the honour of addressing: there is an honest tribute which an author may offer, in such a case, without the suspicion of being actuated

186470.

by unworthy motives, and which he who is addressed may justly receive, as a portion of that well-earned reputation which has been acquired almost by universal consent.

The acknowledged value of those public services, by which the British nation has so long been benefited, would render any detail on the present occasion altogether superfluous: nor is it necessary, for the same reason, either to enlarge upon that intimate acquaintance with the principles of the British constitution, which is so essential in a great public functionary; or the inflexible integrity, unwearied activity, commanding eloquence, and dignified independence of character, which have been displayed by you in the distinguished and arduous station you have so long occupied.

It is, however, with particular reference to the line of conduct pursued by you on the great and vital question of the Catholic Claims, that it appeared impossible to select any character to whom a work like the present could with more propriety be presented.

In what manner the following attempt may have been executed, will remain for others to

decide; among whose opinions, that which may be entertained by yourself (as it will be founded upon an accurate perception of truth, and guided by the desire of arriving at a just conclusion), will hold no inconsiderable rank in the estimation of,

SIR,

Your most faithful

And devoted Servant,

THE AUTHOR.

OCTOBER, 1816.

and generally and uniformly good men, others
not so good, and others who are not good
but have been educated and are now in
good spirits, and are willing to do their duty
and to do their best to help the country.

It is a great thing to have a good
and a good government, and a good
and a good people, and a good
and a good country.

It is a great thing to have a good
and a good government, and a good
and a good people, and a good
and a good country.

ALPHABETICAL DIGEST

OF

CONTENTS.

*The Numerals refer to the Volume, the Figures to the Page, and the * † ‡ to Notes.*

A.

Absolution, Papal, an usurpation of the power of the Creator, i. 57.
Advocates, French, their intended denunciation of the Jesuits' Creed to Louis XIV. ii. 141.

Affidavit from the county of Sligo, i. 354. Various affidavits as to Irish Rebellion of 1798, i. 123 et seq.

Alexander VI. Pope, condemns Pirot's *Apologie des Casuistes*, ii. 126.

— VII. Pope, condemns Moyra's work, and forty-five of the Propositions of the Jesuits, ii. 316. Extract from his censures on the Jesuits, ii. 125.

— VIII. condemns the Jesuits' doctrine of Philosophical sin, ii. 320.

— the Emperor of Russia, banishes the Jesuits, i. 261. ii. 396.

Allegiance to the Bourbons, the French absolved from it by Pius VII. i. 14.

Alliance of Catholics and Jesuits, i. 33, 38, 70, 99, 262.

Ambition of Jesuits, i. 294.

Anecdotes of James II. King of England, i. 63*, 64. Of Louis XIV. i. 67*. Of Cardinal Dubois, i. 67*. Of Chapelle, i. 73. Of Boileau, i. 73*. Of Henry IV. of France. i. 83. Of Beaumont, Archbishop of Paris, i. 85. Of the Duke of Ossonia, i. 101. Of Sir Edward Hales, i. 102*. Of Tachard the Jesuit, i. 299. Of Nolhac the Jesuit, i. 304. Of Lainez the Jesuit, i. 315. Of the Duke of Brunswick, i. 327. Of the Jesuit Priest at Preston, i. 335. Of John III. King of Portugal, i. 377. Of Michael Angelo, ii. 10*. Of Henry III. of France, ii. 11.

Scandalous one of Father Anthony, ii. 107. Of Fortia, a citizen of Tours, ii. 136. Of Robillard, ditto, ii. 137. Of Pope Clement XI. ii. 151. Disgraceful one of Lainez and Bouchet, ii. 152. Of Serry, ii. 153. Of Annat the Jesuit, ii. 170. Of an opulent Jesuit Trader at Hamburg, ii. 190. Singular one of La Rue, ii. 242. Of the impiety of the Jesuits, ii. 297. Of Father Le Jay, ii. 297. Of the Canon of Autun, ii. 362. Of the Lady of La Malle, ii. 363.

Angelo, Michael, anecdote of, ii. 10*.

Angelopolis, Bishop of, extracts from his letter to Pope Innocent X. i. 72, 269*, 300, 372, 330; ii. 124, 182. Convicts the Jesuits of idolatry, i. 72. Important questions by the, i. 300.

Annat, the Jesuit, anecdotes of, ii. 170. Ridicules the Church of Rome, ii. 315.

Answers to unseen works, i. 263.

Anthony, Father Joseph, scandalous anecdote of, ii. 107.

Anticotton, extracts from the, ii. 64.

Proves the Jesuits regicides, ii. 65*.

Apathy of the Protestants accounted for, i. 340.

Aquaviva, General of the Jesuits, his alarm for the Society, and dread of its reform, ii. 284.

Archer, Rev. James, a Catholic Priest, his evidence on the Education of Catholics, ii. 435

Arias Montanus, letter of, to Philip II. ii. 6.

Arnauld, with the approbation of sixteen Bishops, writes a work against the Jesuits, ii. 117. Persecuted by the Jesuits, ii. 118. A princi-

pal enemy of the Casuists, i. 234.

Association of Catholic Charities, nature and income of the, ii. 416.

Number of children educated at the, *ibid.* Confined to teaching plain reading, writing, and plain arithmetic, ii. 417.

Of Reformers in Scotland, for protecting the Protestants, remarks on the, i. 165.

Astronomical Religion of Mr. Dallas described, i. 363.

Attorney-General, the, of Spain, objects to the establishment of the Jesuits, ii. 156.

Of the Parliament of Normandy, remarks of, ii. 143.

Aubigny, Father, plots against the life of Henry IV. ii. 15.

Duplicity of, ii. 42.

Aubry, a Paris Rector, advises the murder of Henry IV. ii. 15.

Augier, the Jesuit, oath administered by, i. 80.

Advises Henry III. to his destruction, ii. 11.

Augustin, St. his doctrine reverted to by the Catholic Church, ii. 166.

Aurelius, Petrus, his letter against the Jesuits quoted, ii. 87.

Auricular confession, particularly approved of by Jesuits and Catholics, i. 36.

Tends above all other means to extend the influence of the Catholic Priesthood, i. 36.

The most infamous and impudent means to usurp the command of mankind, i. 36.

Mischief arising from, i. 57.

Austria, Empress of, deprives the Jesuits of their despotic power, ii. 154.

Austrian states demand the expulsion of the Jesuits, ii. 6.

Authorities for Jesuits examined, i. 274—294.

AUTHORS cited.

Alexander VII. Pope, ii. 240, 315, 316.

Alexander VIII. ii. 320.

Annat, ii. 315.

Arias Montanus, ii. 6.

Arnauld, ii. 87, 95, 205, 370.

Aurelius, Petrus, ii. 87.

Bacon, Lord, i. 284.

Baillet, i. 376.

Bauni, i. 240.

ii. 113, 314.

Bausset, i. 55, 286.

Baxter, i. 90, 106.

Bayle, i. 255.

Becan, ii. 48.

Bellarmino, ii. 46.

Benedict XIV. Pope, i. 362.

Benzi, i. 247.

ii. 332.

Berkeley, Sir John, i. 90.

Berruyer, i. 243.

Blair, Mr. ii. 448.

Authors cited.

Bochart, ii. 174.

Boswell, Mr. James, i. 265.

Brisacier, ii. 168.

Buffon, i. 281.

Burnet, Bishop, i. 36.

Busembaum, ii. 144.

C. Butler, i. 143.

ii. 448.

Callier, i. 80.

Camden, i. 156.

Canning, Right Hon. G. ii. 398*.

Caramuel, i. 238.

Casnedi, i. 246.

ii. 132.

Castera, i. 276.

Chalmers, i. 28.

Chalotais, i. 75, 323.

Chatham, Lord, i. 89.

Claude, i. 33.

Clement XIV. Pope, i. 11.

Colbert (Minister to Louis XIV.), ii. 144, 393.

Compton, Dr. i. 327.

Cook, i. 169.

Cotton, Father, ii. 47.

Coudrette, i. 27.

ii. 375.

Courtin, i. 105.

D'Alembert, i. 75.

Dallas, Mr. i. 12, et seq.

Daniel, Father, i. 256.

Damianus, i. 371.

D'Argentré, i. 241.

ii. 10.

D'Avila, ii. 15.

De Canaze, ii. 33.

De Gondrin, i. 85.

D'Eguilles, i. 278.

Dellon, i. 269.

De Noailles, Cardinal, ii. 188, 189.

De Ploix, Cesar, ii. 64.

De Servien, ii. 370.

De Thou, i. 80.

ii. 1.

De Vallory, M. ii. 190.

De Villeroy, ii. 24.

D'Orsane, M. ii. 188.

D'Ossat, ii. 36, 324.

Du Belloi, ii. 370.

Du Boulay, ii. 3.

Duchesne, ii. 165.

Dupin, ii. 86.

Du Quesne, ii. 314, 375.

Eleutheropolis, Bishop of, ii. 325.

Fabri, ii. 106, 315.

Fairfax, i. 90.

Fan, ii. 325.

Fenelon, Archbishop, i. 363.

Fox, Right Hon. Charles James, i. 104.

Ganganelli, i. 267.

Garasse, ii. 81.

Gilbert, M. ii. 148.

Godefroi, M. ii. 237.

Goujet, ii. 135.

Grebert, M. i. 388.

Gregory XIII. Pope, ii. 337.

Gregory XIV. Pope, ii. 311.

Gretzer, i. 328.

Grose, i. 213.

Grotius, i. 99, 284.

Hasenmuller, i. 229.

Heliopolis, Bishop of, i. 296.

ii. 373.

Henry IV. of France, i. 83.

ii. 370.

Hippesley, Sir John Cox, i. 52, 257, 259, 366.

Holland, Lord, i. 104.

Holles, Lord, i. 89.

Horne, Bishop, i. 73.

Hume, Mr. David, i. 111.

Husbands, i. 89.

Ignatius, St. ii. 260.

James, Dr. i. 328.

Jarrigue, ii. 20.

Johnson, Dr. Samuel, i. 110.

Jouvencel, i. 155.

ii. 368.

Authors cited.

391. Julius III. Pope, ii. 340.
 Juan, i. 286.
 Knox, John, i. 167.
 La Martelière, ii. 45. L'Amy, or
 Amicus, i. 238. ii. 130, et seq.
 Landaff, Bishop of, i. 250. La-
 nuza, ii. 266. Leibnitz, i. 284.
 Leira, Bishop of, ii. 189. Lilly,
 i. 89. L'Honoré, ii. 308.
 Louail, ii. 174. Lucius, ii. 22.
 Ludlow, i. 88.
 Mansfield, Lord, i. 98. Mariana,
 ii. 49, 282. Marion, M. ii. 305.
 Martin, M. i. 298. ii. 374.
 Maseres, Baron, i. 89, 117.
 Matthieu, i. 256. Mauricaste, Bishop of, ii. 331. May, i. 89.
 Mezerai, i. 79. ii. 11. M'Crie,
 i. 169. Millar, i. 93. Milner,
 Dr. (Catholic Bishop), i. 103,
 357. Milner, Dean, i. 341.
 Mills, i. 37. Molina, ii.
 305. Monclar, i. 75, 321.
 Montesquieu, i. 71, 280. Mo-
 teri, ii. 93, 206. Moya, ii.
 131. Muratori, i. 284. Mus-
 grave, Sir Richard, i. 120.
 Navarrete, Bishop of St. Domingo,
 ii. 332, 353. Nicole, i. 234.
 O'Conor, Dr. i. 13.
 Palafax, Bishop, i. 72. Pascal, i.
 47. Pasquier, ii. 2, 199, 206.
 Paul, Father, i. 391. ii. 32.
 Paul III. Pope, i. 11. ii. 218.
 287. Perrault, Abbé, ii. 383.
 Pinkerton, i. 58, 60. Pirot, M. i.
 234. Piozzi, Mrs. i. 284. Pius
 VII. Pope, i. 10, 16. Possevin,
 i. 256. Proyart, Abbé, i. 51.
 Prynne, i. 86. Pucelle, Abbé,
 ii. 141.
 Racine, ii. 34. Rapin, i. 63, 111,
 150, &c. Raynal, Abbé, i. 80.
 Richelieu, Cardinal de, i. 287.
 Richer, ii. 62. Robertson,
 i. 42. Robison, i. 63. Russell,
 Lady, i. 111.
 Sa, Emmanuel, ii. 289. Sac-
 chini, ii. 8, 393. Sanctarel,
 ii. 76. Serry, ii. 166, 313. Se-
 guier, i. 383. Sharpe, Gran-
 ville, i. 133. Simonelli, ii. 327.
 Stock, Dr. i. 131. St. Amour,
 ii. 86. St. Pol de Leon, Bishop
 of, i. 16. St. Pons, Bishop of,
 ii. 361, 384. Suares, ii. 49.
 Sully, Due de, i. 80, 153, 258.
 ii. 39, 116, &c.
 Temple, Sir John, i. 90. Thorpe,

Authors cited.

Dr. i. 132. Tolendal, Lally, i.
 49, 75-84.
 Ulloa, i. 286.
 Varan, i. 386. Van Essen, ii. 6.
 Villefort, ii. 174. Villers, i.
 36. ii. 396. Visdelon, Bishop
 of Claudiopolis, ii. 328. Vol-
 taire, i. 47.
 Walker, Clement, i. 90. Warbur-
 ton, i. 89.
Autun, anecdote of the Canon of, ii.
 362.
Aveiro, Duke of, forms a design to
 assassinate the King of Portugal,
 i. 345. Detection and execution of,
 i. 347.
 B.
Bacon, Lord, quoted by Mr. Dallas,
 i. 284.
Bankrupt, an extraordinary one, i.,
 301st.
Barberini, Cardinal, conspires to es-
 tablish the Catholic Religion in
 England, i. 88.
Barriere trained by the Jesuits to as-
 sassinate Henry IV. of France, i.
 37. ii. 13-15, 16.
Baudouin, the Jesuit, in league with
 Garnett, ii. 25.
Bauni, the Casuist, his works de-
 nounced by the University of Paris,
 ii. 113. Defended by Mr. Dallas,
 i. 240. Scandalous principles of,
 ii. 314.
Bausset, cited by Mr. Dallas, for the
 Jesuits, i. 55, 286.
Baxter, on Popish plot, i. 106, 107.
 Confirms Prynne's testimony, i.
 90.
Bayanism, its derivation, ii. 164. Op-
 posed by the Jesuits, *ibid*.
Bayle's testimony, i. 253, 254. Par-
 tially quoted by Mr. Dallas, i. 253.
Beaumont, Archbishop of Paris, his
 illiteracy, i. 85. Attached to the
 Jesuits, i. 291. His ignorance,
 vanity, and arbitrary acts, *ibid*.
 His Pastoral Charge burned by the
 Parliament, *ibid*.
Beccan, the Jesuit, treasonable publi-
 cation of, ii. 48.
Becket, Thomas à, account of, i. 222.
Beckman, the Jesuit, his dispute with
 M. de Ligny, ii. 148.
Belgium, Bishops of, extracts from
 their letter to the King of the Ne-
 therlands, i. 18. Church of, re-
 duced to a deplorable condition by
 the Jesuits, ii. 54.

Bellarmino, Jesuit and Cardinal, sent to France by Pope Sixtus V. to foment the League, i. 79.

Benedict XIV. not imposed on by the Jesuits, ii. 158. Censures the works of *Berruyer*, ii. 306. Issues many Bulls, Briefs, and Decrees against the Jesuits and their idolatrous practices, ii. 330.

Benzi, the Casuist, defended by Mr. Dallas, i. 247. Justifies *les at-touchemens mamillaires*, ii. 332.

Berkeley, Sir John's, Memoirs, confirm Pryne's testimony, i. 90.

Berruyer, the Casuist, defended by Mr. Dallas, i. 242. The works of, multiplied by the Jesuits, whilst condemned by the Pope and Bishops, i. 243. Censured by Popes Benedict XIV. and Clement XIII. and twenty-four Bishops, ii. 306. Creates general indignation, ii. 306.

Bible, the, opposed by Catholics, i. 355, 361. Rejected by their Priests, ii. 402, 467. Concealed by the Jesuits from their students, i. 321. Not admitted by the Catholics into their system of education, ii. 401 et seq. Its use decidedly opposed by the two Popish Magazines, ii. 402. No part of it whatever allowed to be taught in the Catholic Schools, ii. 426. Admitted to be read in France in the vulgar tongue, ii. 428.

— *Societies* strenuously opposed by the Jesuits, i. 362. Attacked by Mr. Dallas, i. 263. Viliified by the Roman Catholics, ii. 401.

Bishops and Clergy of France, brief history of the, i. 293.

Blair, William, Esq. his evidence on the Education of the Poor, ii. 418.

Blake, A. R. Esq. his evidence on the Education of the Poor, ii. 458.

Blasphemy of the Jesuits, i. 136. ii. 258. Of the Jesuits Pichon, Har-douin, and *Berruyer*, ii. 305.

Boileau, anecdote of, i. 73*.

Bonaparte, his inauguration by Pius VII. 13. Servile adulation of, by Pius VII. 15. More tolerant than the Pope, who rejects the article allowing freedom of worship, i. 16.

Booker, Mr. Joseph, his evidence on the Education of Catholics, ii. 416.

Boswell's Life of Dr. Johnson, quoted, i. 285.

Bossuet, his opinion on the Provincial Letters, i. 47*.

Bouchet, the Jesuit, disgraceful anecdote of, ii. 152.

Bramston, Rev. J. Y. a Catholic Priest, his evidence on the Education of Catholics, ii. 431.

Brest, Parish Church at, seized by the Jesuits, ii. 139.

“*Brief Account*” of the Jesuits, criticisms on the, i. 24.

British Museum contains numerous works on the Jesuits, i. 31*.

— *Union School*, Address of the, to the Public, ii. 454. Singular conduct of the Catholic Clergy respecting the, ii. 456.

Bronswell, the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, his prophecy, i. 385.

Brunswick, anecdote of the Duke of, i. 327.

Buffon, quoted by Mr. Dallas, in favor of the Jesuits, i. 281. His profligate character, i. 282.

Bull of Pope Gregory XIII. an account of, ii. 185. Of Pius IV. quoted, i. 328*.

‘*Bull Unigenitus*’ extracts from the, i. 356. ii. 462. Procured from Rome by the Jesuits for their own objects, ii. 174. Declared to be in full force now, ii. 428, 434. Its main object to prevent the general use of the Holy Scriptures, ii. 434.

Burgoyn, Montagu, Esq. his evidence on the Education of Catholics, ii. 429.

Burnet, Bishop, on the Popish Plot, i. 105, 108. On Lord Stafford's guilt, i. 108. Extracts from his works, i. 102*, 112, 160*.

Bushe, Mr. Solicitor-General of Ireland, his address at Clonmell, i. 152.

Butler, Charles, Esq. his work on Catholic Emancipation, i. 143*. His evidence on the Education of Catholics, ii. 423. Eulogizes Mr. Dallas's Defence of the Jesuits, ii. 448. Accused by Bishop Milner of interfering in the ecclesiastical affairs of the Catholics, *ibid.* His disputes with Dr. Poynter, ii. 447-451. Praises the liberal spirit of Louis XIV. ii. 463.

Butterworth, Joseph, Esq. M. P. his evidence on the Education of the Poor, ii. 438.

C.

Cajetan, Cardinal, sent to France by Pope Sixtus V. to oppose Henry IV. ii. 15.

Cambray, Archbishop of, his Certificate respecting the Fathers of the Oratory in Liege, ii. 149.

Camden, on Jesuits and Priests, i. 155-158.

Campion, the Jesuit Missionary, an account of, i. 154.

Canning, Right Hon. George, his *beau rôle* for uniting Protestants and Catholics examined, ii. 398*.

Capuchins, their disputes with the Jesuits, ii. 153.

Carraccioli, the author of Gangalini's Letters, i. 266.

Casimir, King of Poland, grants privileges to the Jesuits, ii. 157.

Casredi, the Jesuit, defended by Mr. Dallas, i. 244.

Cis-Browne, Jesuit establishment at, described, i. 271, 273.

Casuistry of Jesuits and Catholics, i. 233-252.

"**Casuists**, *Apology for the*," written by Pirot, an eminent Jesuit, i. 233. Advocates rebellion, assassination, &c. i. 234. Dispersed by the Jesuits in France, ii. 169.

Catherine de Medicis, favoured the Jesuits, ii. 1. Planned and directed the massacre of St. Bartholomew, ii. 2*.

—, Empress of Russia, her motives for favouring the Jesuits, i. 274. Character of, i. 275.

Catholic Claims, i. 74, 117, 120, 253.

Catholics. Vide *Roman Catholics*.

Cavan, Petition from the Protestants in the County of, i. 142.

Ceremonies substituted for Religion by the Catholics, i. 58.

Chalotais's observations on the Education of the Jesuits, i. 321.

Chapelle, anecdote of, i. 73*.

Charles I. King of England, his misfortunes owing to a bias in favour of Popery, i. 88 et seq. Character of, i. 95. And his Parliament, subject of dispute between, i. 90.

—, Emanuel, King of Sardinia, seizes on the treasure of the Jesuits at Chambery, ii. 150.

Chatel instigated by the Jesuits to murder Henry IV. i. 83, ii. 17.

China, conduct of the Jesuits in, i. 315.

Choiseul, Bishop of Tournay, letter of, to Pope Innocent XI. quoted, ii. 170.

Christianity allied with the worship of Confucius by the Jesuits, ii. 150.

Church of Rome, its intolerance as great as in the dark ages, i. 23.

Claude on the Reformation, i. 33*.

Clement, the assassin of Henry III. ii. 14.

—, XI. Pope, anecdote of, ii. 151. His cunning and duplicity, ii. 172.

—, XIII. Pope, cited by Mr. Dallas in favor of the Jesuits, i. 277. Censures the works of Bertruyer, ii. 306.

—, XIV. his order for abolishing the Jesuits abrogated, i. 11. Admits that the Jesuits were founded for the conversion of Heretics, i. 19. Compared by Mr. Dallas to Pontius Pilate, i. 264. Deliberates long, and consults before he abolishes the Jesuits, i. 266. Remarks of, on suppressing the Jesuits, i. 267. His suspicious death, *ibid.* His sincerity, i. 268. Brief of, to Louis XV. i. 350.

Clericus, letters of, i. 26, 367.

Coadjutors of Jesuits, their functions described, ii. 211.

Codes of law, all are, or pretend to be, founded on sound morality, i. 306.

Coimbra, University of, opposes the Jesuits, i. 386.

Colin, Father, important quotation from, ii. 353.

Commerce of Jesuits, i. 296-301.

Commolet, a regicide preacher of the Jesuits, ii. 13, 15.

Complaints of the Universities and Ecclesiastics against the Jesuits, extracts from, ii. 361.

Congregation, the Scotch, and Knox, vindicated, i. 179.

Conscience, erroneous, Mr. Dallas's singular opinion of, i. 249.

Conspiracy, an account of the, to assassinate the King of Portugal, i. 346. Against Christianity, previous to the abolition of the Jesuits, i. 350. Imputation of, against all who oppose the Jesuits, i. 26, 365.

Contempt of the Papal Decree by Fabri the Jesuit, ii. 316. Approved of by the Jesuit Provincial, *ibid.*

Corinth, Archbishop of, his Declaration, i. 315*.

Corrupt Morality of the Jesuits obstinately maintained, ii. 124.

Coudrette, character of, i. 27. His History of the Jesuits, a principal cause of their suppression, *ibid.* Important extracts from, i. 299.

Council of Trent quoted by the Catholic Bishops of Belgium, i. 18. Partially restrained the Jesuits, ii. 300. The restrictions of the, evaded by the Jesuits, ii. 300.

Counter letters allowed by the Jesuits to falsify ostensible ones, ii. 152.

Cracow, Archbishop of, his rights invaded by the Jesuits, ii. 158. *University of*, its detestation of the Jesuits, i. 321. ii. 56.

Crichton, a Jesuit Priest, strives to assassinate Queen Elizabeth, ii. 21.

Crime sanctioned by papal and priestly Indulgences, i. 57.

Crown jewels of France pledged by the Jesuits, ii. 162.

D.

D'Alembert and *Diderot*, their false philosophy mentioned by Mr. Dallas, i. 50. *D'Alembert* declared, but not proved by Mr. Dallas to be an enemy to the Jesuits, i. 54.

Dallas, Mr. Reply to his Defence of the Order of the Jesuits, i. 33. Complains that the Catholics have been identified with the Jesuits, notwithstanding they will not permit themselves to be separated, i. 33, 39. His unfair mode of rejecting or appealing to history as suits his purpose, i. 31, 41. Suppresses facts, i. 43. His charge of the fabrications and forgeries of the Jansenists, refuted, i. 48. Rejects all testimony and evidence against the Jesuits, i. 48. Adopts the favourite imputation of the Jesuits, that all their opponents are enemies to true religion and virtue, i. 49. ii. 171. Extracts from his work, as to French Revolution, i. 49-52. His fallacious view of the cause of the French Revolution, i. 49. His ingenuity and skill in amplifying the observations of others, i. 52. His false reasoning detected, i. 55, 79. Assertions of, incapable of proof, i. 60. Theatrical assertion of, i. 61. His charge of disingenuousness towards the Jesuits answered, i. 70. Refuses the most unquestionable evidence against the Jesuits, i. 29, 83. Abuses Prynne, and attempts to discredit the testimony of De Thou, i. 96. His reprehensible or intentional ambiguity, i. 104. Asserts Lord Stafford's innocence, notwithstanding all the evidence to the contrary, and without presenting

one single fact which may establish that opinion, i. 108-110. Incautious in his conclusions, i. 113. Endeavours to weaken the authority of the *State Trials* by a contemptuous notice of them, i. 114. His accusation of Sir William Scroggs examined and refuted, i. 115-116. Defends the Catholic Priests of Ireland, i. 121. His unfair quotations from Rapin, i. 147. Partial statements of, i. 153. Misrepresents, and suppresses, Hume's History respecting the Jesuits, i. 163, 164. His pretensions of attachment to the Church of England examined, i. 183. Declares "the Reformation has generated the most absurd superstitions," i. 183. Accuses the adversaries of the Jesuits of "rebellious and revolutionary" purposes, i. 233. Defends the Jesuitical Casuists L'Amy, Moya, Bauni, Berruyer, Casnedi, and Benzi, i. 235-248. Declares that we ought always to follow the dictates of conscience, even when it is erroneous, i. 249. Defends the Jesuits at the expence of the Catholics proper, i. 251. Quotes Bayle partially, i. 253. Answers pamphlets without seeing them, i. 263. Compares Clement XIV. to Pontius Pilate, i. 264. Denies that the Jesuits were connected with the Inquisition, i. 268. His authorities in favor of the Jesuits examined, i. 274. His misstatements respecting the Empress Catherine of Russia, i. 277. Quotes Montesquieu partially, i. 279. Most of his authorities and arguments are to be found in the "Apology for the Jesuits," i. 294. Denies the ambition of the Jesuits, i. 294, 295. Denies the commerce of the Jesuits, i. 296. And their sedition, i. 301. Declares that the Jesuits have been actuated by the sublimest motives, such as right to be attributed to Angels!!! i. 61-103. His fallacious account of the Jesuits in England, i. 332. Stupendously conceals the atrocities of the Jesuits in Portugal, i. 345-2. Complains that the English are educated without religion, i. 342. His own loyalty and religion, i. 344. Conclusion of his observations, i. 366.

Damianus, extract from his work, i.

371. Contrasts Luther with Loyola, *ibid.*

D'Avila, reference to his account of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, i. 309. ii. 2, 309.

De Canaze, the French Ambassador at Venice, denounces the Jesuits to Henry IV. ii. 33.

Deception the invariable policy of the Jesuits, i. 298*.

D'Eguilles, the testimony of, quoted by Mr. Dallas, i. 55, 278.

De La Tour, the Jesuit, exalts the piety of Voltaire, ii. 147.

De Ligny, M. his difference with the Jesuit Beckman, ii. 148. His work referred to, *ibid.*

Dellon, his account of the Inquisition at Goa, i. 269.

De Thou defended, i. 96, 98. Liberality and candour of, i. 97. Lord Mansfield's declaration concerning, i. 99. Extracts from his work, i. 255. ii. 432*.

Diderot asserted by Mr. Dallas to be an enemy to the Jesuits, i. 54.

Diets of Warsaw, Cracow, and Lithuania protest against the Jesuits, ii. 157.

Dissenters, English, loyal subjects, i. 181.

D'Orsane, M. quotation from, ii. 188.

Donay, the divines of, persecuted by the Jesuits, ii. 148.

Drunkenness, a vice indigenous to the Irish Catholic Priesthood, i. 145.

Du Bellay, Eustache, Bishop of Paris, denounces the Jesuits as dangerous, i. 383.

Dubois, Cardinal, an active sceptic, i. 67. Reply of, to Louis XIV. ii. 67*.

Du Mesnil, Advocate General, quoted, ii. 3.

E.

East Indies, intrigues of the Jesuits in the, ii. 161.

Education of the Jesuits, i. 316-324, 352, 353, 400. ii. 282. Mr. Dallas, Villers, Monclar, and Chalotais on the, i. 316-321. Important questions relative to, i. 317.

—, *National*, Mr. Dallas's remarks on, i. 51. Answered, i. 352.

—, *of the Poor*, Report of the Committee of the House of Commons on the, ii. 404-461. Evidence of Mr. Thomas Finigan, on the, ii. 404-409, 459. Mr. John Kelly, ii. 409. The Rev. Edward Norris, ii. 411. Joseph Fletcher, Esq. ii. 412, 450. Mr. William F. Lloyd, ii. 414. Mr. Joseph Booker, ii. 416. William Blair, Esq. ii. 418. Charles Butler, Esq. ii. 423. Montagu Burgoine, Esq. ii. 429. Rev. James Yorke Branston, ii. 431. Rev. James Archer, ii. 435. Rev. Rich. Horrabin, ii. 437. Joseph Butterworth, Esq. ii. 438. Dr. William Poynter, Vicar-Apostolic, ii. 439-450.

Education of the Roman Catholics, and the rejection of the Bible by their Priests, ii. 401-467.

Elizabeth, Queen, the Pope excites the Papists to assassinate her, i. 118. The subjects of, absolved from their allegiance, by the Pope, *ibid.* Excommunicated by the Pope, *ibid.* Her reproof to the Judges explained, i. 148. Her enemies enumerated, i. 152. Tolerates all peaceable Catholics, *ibid.* Declaration of, respecting the Jesuits, i. 159. Sir F. Walsingham's account of her Council, i. 161. Letter of, to Henry III. of France, respecting the Jesuits, ii. 21. Discovers the designs of the Jesuits, ii. 21. Conspiracies of the Jesuits against, ii. 162.

Emissaries of Rome, essentially different from the English Sectaries, i. 182.

Emperors, Kings, and Bishops, enrolled in the Congregations of the Jesuits, ii. 187.

Encyclopædia Britannica, observations on the article *Jesuits* in the, i. 40.

Encyclopédie, French, the article *Jesuits* in the, written by Diderot, i. 54.

England, her course with respect to the Jesuits and Catholics, pointed out, ii. 397.

Episcopal authority in Ireland, i. 130.

Europe, ignorance of, in the sixteenth century, i. 186.

Extraits des Assertions, testify against the Jesuits, i. 84. Are from the works of the Jesuits themselves, i. 84. A record of the immorality of the Society, i. 85.

F.

Fabri the Jesuit, his contempt of the Papal decree, ii. 315.

Fairfax's Memorials confirm Prynne's testimony, i. 90.

Ferdinand King of Sicily revives the Order of the Jesuits in 1804, i. 10.

Finigan, Mr. T. A. his evidence on

the Education of Catholics, ii. 404, 459.
Flanders, an account of the Jesuit establishments in, i. 388. Magistrates of, oppose the Jesuits, i. 389.
Fletcher, Joseph, Esq. his evidence on the Education of the Poor, ii. 412, 450.
Foreign ordination no longer necessary, i. 270.
Forms, processions, ceremonics, and externals, substituted for religion by the Catholics, i. 58.
Formulary, historical memoirs on the, referred to, ii. 166.
Fortia, a citizen of rank in Tours, anecdote of, ii. 136.
Founder, the, of a Jesuit College or House is entitled to 30,000 Masses and 100,000 Rosaries during his life, and more after his death, ii. 368. Of two Houses or Colleges, entitled, in his own right, to 120,000 Masses and 80,000 Rosaries, *ibid.*
Fox, Mr. on the Popish Plot, i. 103, 104. His declamation noticed, i. 114. Admits of a design to restore Property by James II. i. 105. His eulogium of Baxter, i. 106.
Foxes and Firebrands, work quoted, ii. 163.
France, Bishops of, protest against the Concordat of Pius VII. i. 16. Cited by Mr. Dallas in favor of the Jesuits, i. 287. How imposed on by the Jesuits, i. 292. University of, its testimony opposed to that of Mr. Dallas, i. 295.
Frederick King of Prussia, D'Eguilles, and Bossuet, in favor of the Jesuits, i. 55. Quoted by Mr. Dallas, i. 284.
Freedom of opinion, a common privilege in discussing the question of Jesuits, i. 74.
Freemasonry an engine of intrigue used by the Jesuits, i. 63.
French Infidels and Philosophers, denied to have sprung from the suppression of the Order of the Jesuits, i. 49-68, 349.
——— Revolutionists, not more inimical to the Jesuits than to religion in general, i. 53.

G.

Galeoti, the Jesuit, becomes Governor of the Bank of Rome, ii. 314.
Galileo, the astronomer, condemned by the Inquisition, i. 364.

Gandalphy, Rev. Mr. publicly preaches against the St. Giles's Free School, ii. 407. Goes to the Scholoi, and orders the children to go home, ii. 459.
Ganganelli, accused by Mr. Dallas, of paving the way for the French revolution, i. 50. The *ca*, not authentic, i. 266. Written by Caraccioli, i. 266.
Garnett, the Jesuit, in various plots in England, ii. 21, 22, 24.
Gerson, the Jesuit, quoted, as to Inquisition, i. 269.
Gilbert, Chancellor of the University of Douay, opposes the Jesuits, ii. 147. Persecuted by them, ii. 148.
Glory of God, the great pretext of the Jesuits, i. 307.
Goa, the Inquisition at, founded by the Jesuit Xavier, i. 269.
Godeau, Bishop, Letter of, quoted, ii. 167*.
Godfrey, Sir Edmonbury, his murderer, i. 106.
Grebert the Jesuit, curious account of, ii. 238-9. Observations by, on the Jesuits' doctrine of Probability, ii. 243.
Gregory XIII, Pope, his Bull, an account of, ii. 185. Accedes to the wish of the Jesuits to re-establish their privileges, ii. 300. Grants the Jesuits the privilege to practise the art of medicine, ii. 376.
——— XIV. Pope, the firm friend of the Jesuits, ii. 277.
Gretser, the Jesuit, convicted of falsehood by Dr. James, i. 328. His errors, *ibid.*
Grose, extracts from, in proof of Papal corruptions, i. 213-215.
Grotius, his high opinion of De Thou, i. 99.
Guenot the Jesuit, scandalous declaration of, ii. 42.
Gueret, the Jesuit regicide, ii. 18.
Guignard, Professor, abominable work of, extract from, ii. 18. Condemned to death, *ibid.*
Guise, Duke de, active in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, ii. 2*.

H.

Hales, Sir Edward, anecdote of, i. 102.
Halicarnassus, Bishop of, cruel treatment of, by the Jesuits, ii. 330.
Haller quoted by Mr. Dallas, i. 283.

Harrach, Cardinal, Memorial of, to the Pope, extracts from, ii. 92.

Heliopolis, the Bishop of, accuses the Jesuits, i. 296, 297.

Henry II. of France, protects the Jesuits, i. 382.

— III. of France, anecdote of, ii. 11. Assassinated by Clement, ii. 14.

— IV. of France, attempted assassination of, by the Jesuits, i. 83. Fictitious, and real statement of, i. 254-256. Extract from his letter to the Pope, ii. 36. His remarkable statement to Sully, ii. 39. Assassinated by Ravaillac, ii. 42. His mistaken policy, i. 44*.

Heretical Princes, right to depose, claimed by Pius VII. i. 20.

Hippesley, Sir John, excepted from the anathema of Mr. Dallas, i. 52*, 366. Attacked by Mr. Dallas, i. 257. Vindication of, i. 259.

Holland, Lord, quotation from his Address in Fox's History, i. 104*.

Holles, Lord, confirms Prynne's testimony, i. 89.

Holt, the Jesuit, his plots, ii. 23.

Holy Scriptures, the, wholly excluded from the Catholic Schools in England and Ireland, i. 353*.

Horrabin, the Rev. Richard, a Catholic Priest, his evidence on the Education of the Roman Catholics, ii. 437. His equivocal conduct respecting the British Union School, ii. 456.

Hume, his levity of character, i. 88. On the Popish Plot, temp. Charles II. i. 110-111. Dr. Johnson's and the author's opinion respecting, i. 110. His account of the zeal of the Jesuits, i. 162.

Husband's Collection of State Papers confirms Prynne's testimony, i. 89.

I.

Idolatrous ceremonies of China, advocated by the Jesuits, ii. 151.

Ignatius Loyola, i. 375. His first colleagues, 1534-8, i. 376. Panegyric on, by Father Jouvencel, with the comments of the University of Paris, ii. 369.

Impediments to admission in the Institute of the Jesuits, removed by the riches of the candidate, ii. 196.

Indulgences, priestly, a toleration and sanction of crime, i. 57, 185-6-7.

Infallibility insisted on by the Jesuits and Catholics, i. 37. Violated by

one Pope erecting, and another suppressing, the Order, i. 263.

Infidelity much encouraged by the abuses of the Catholic religion, i. 59. Promoted by the Jesuits, i. 62. Closely allied to superstition, i. 56. Not originating in the suppression of the Jesuits, as contended, i. 350. Patronized by the Regent Duke of Orleans, i. 68.

Innocent X. condemns Chinese idolatry, ii. 315.

— XI. confirms the Decrees against Chinese idolatry, ii. 318. Condemns 65 of the Jesuits' propositions, ii. 132.

— XIII. resolution of, against the Jesuits, ii. 328. Suspicious death of, ii. 328.

Inquisition, the, restoration of, by the present Pope Pius VII. stamps his character, i. 21. Of Spain, its edict, i. 21*, 22, 23. At Goa, an account of, i. 269*. Condemns Galileo the astronomer, i. 364.

— and Jesuits, their connexion, i. 268, 269.

Institute of Jesuits, i. 304-306. ii. 175 to the end.

Intolerance of the Church of Rome, as great as in the dark ages, i. 23, 133.

Irish Massacre, in 1641, i. 118, 119.

— Priests, superintend the massacre at Scullabogue, in 1798, i. 123. Their sedition and rebellion, *ibid.* Their bigotry and intolerance, i. 133. Their immorality, i. 144. Their venality, fraud, and extortion, i. 146.

J.

Jacob, a Jesuit regicide, ii. 19.

James I. King of England, his proclamation against the Jesuits in 1610, ii. 25. Ordains the Oath of Allegiance, which the Jesuits declare against, ii. 26. Conspiracies excited against him by the Jesuits, ii. 24, 25, 162.

— II. King of England, his affection for, and obsequiousness to, the Jesuits, i. 63*, 64. Anecdotes of, i. 64, 65, 66. Causes the Masonic Lodges in France to be the rendezvous of his adherents, i. 65. Attempts to restore Popery, i. 105.

— Dr. convicts Gretser the Jesuit of the grossest falsehood, i. 328.

Jansenism, why opposed by the Jesuits, ii. 167, 168.

Jansenius, an account of, ii. 168.

Jansenists, the most formidable opponents of the Jesuits, i. 44†. Chiefly consisted of the more virtuous and honest Catholics, i. 45†. Accused of fabrication and forgery by Mr. Dallas without proof, i. 48. Became a general name of reproach for all who opposed the Jesuits, ii. 171.

Jansenist Dictionary, published by the Jesuits, ii. 321, 332. Condemned by the Pope, *ibid.*

Jesuit at Liege, important letter from, i. 63*.

Jesuits, the, are the most active agents of the Church of Rome, and constituent parts of her system, i. 9. Restoration of, by Pope Pius VII. i. 10. Revival of, by the Emperor Paul of Russia, in 1801, *ibid.* By the King of Sicily in 1804, *ibid.* Powers granted to their General, *ibid.* Recommended by Pius VII. to temporal Princes and Lords, i. 11. Original constitution of, by Pope Paul III. *ibid.* Great powers granted to, by Paul III. in 1543, and further enlarged, 1549, *ibid.* Modern vindication of, in the English newspapers, *ibid.* Declared by Pope Clement XIV. to have been founded for the conversion of Heretics, i. 19. Established, contrary to law in England, i. 25. Particularly approve of auricular confession, i. 36. Organize the attempt of Barriere, on Henry IV. of France, i. 37. Blasphemous doctrines of, *ibid.* Vindicate Protestant persecution, *ibid.* Of Clermont declare the Pope as infallible as Jesus Christ himself, *ibid.** Description of, by Robertson, i. 39. To be considered as one Order, and not as individuals, i. 40. Make Paraguay an independent empire, i. 41. Their contests with the Jansenists, i. 45*. Declaration of the Parliament of Thoulouse against, i. 48. Mr Dallas's theory that the French revolution was produced by their suppression, i. 50. Their supposed enemies enumerated by Mr. Dallas, i. 52. Important inquiry respecting, i. 53. Charge against, by Professor Robison, i. 63. When suppressed, intrigue against Religion, by means of Free-masonry, in which they took an active part in France, i.

63, 66. In China, i. 71, 73. Instead of Christianizing idolaters, they heathenize Christians, i. 72. Their evasive pretext for Chinese idolatry, *ibid.* In the League of France, i. 79, 80. Proofs against, by Mezerai, i. 79. Excite the assassination of Henry IV. of France, i. 83. Prynne's important evidence against, i. 86. Represent Queen Elizabeth as persecuting them, merely on account of their religion, i. 149. In Queen Elizabeth's reign, i. 159. Hume on, i. 161-164. In England, i. 231. Casuistry of, i. 233-250. Multiply the editions of Berruyer's work, while they are condemned by the Popes and Bishops, i. 243. Revival of, dangerous to Protestants, i. 253. Their foreign allegiance, i. 257-259. In Russia, i. 260, 261. The agents of Popes and Kings in bad measures, i. 260. Expelled from the Russian capitals in 1815, i. 261. The enemies of every valuable institution, i. 262. Oppose the Bible Society, *ibid.* Indefatigable in making converts to Popery, *ibid.* Remarks on Pope Clement XIV.'s abolition of the Order, i. 266. In Ireland, i. 271. Their establishment at Castle-Browne, an account of, *ibid.* Favoured by the Empress Catherine of Russia, i. 275. Their reception in Russia, then, no proof in their favor, *ibid.* Bribe Cardinal Torregiani to procure Bulls in their favor, i. 288. Their assertions collected by the Parliament of Paris, and presented to Louis XV. in 1762, i. 289. Means by which they succeeded with the Bishops of France, i. 292. Louis XV.'s final edict against, in 1764, i. 293. Accused of persecution by the Bishop of Heliopolis, i. 296. Their commerce and usurious conduct, i. 296-299. Recognise each other by signs like Free-masons, i. 298. Deception their invariable policy, *ibid.** Their fraud and disgraceful bankruptcy at Seville, i. 300. Their sedition slightly passed over by Mr. Dallas, i. 301. Usurp the sovereignty of Paraguay, i. 302. Institute of, its professed object, as stated by Mr. Dallas, i. 305. Tumult their true element, i. 311*. Conduct of, in Malabar and China, i. 315.

Charge against, by Cardinal de Tournon, i. 315. Complaints against, by the Universities of Paris, Louvain, and the Chapter of Leopold, i. 320-322. Withhold the Bible from their Students, i. 321. Their Colleges shut up by the King of Sardinia, in 1728, i. 322. Complaints against, by the Archbishop of Vienna, *ibid.* Leave their pupils in great ignorance, i. 323. The King of Portugal's edict against, *ibid.* In England, i. 332-342. On their dispensing power with respect to oaths of allegiance, i. 336. An account of their establishment at Stonyhurst, i. 333. Their atrocities concealed by Mr. Dallas, i. 345. Why banished from Portugal, *ibid.* Conspire to assassinate the King of Portugal, and are protected by the Pope, i. 347. Their suppression did not give rise to infidelity on the Continent, as asserted by Mr. Dallas, i. 350. Pretended conspirators against, enumerated by Mr. Dallas, i. 366. Origin of, i. 369. Opposed to the Reformation, i. 370. And other Orders, i. 373. Power, wealth, and influence, i. 374. Account of their first rise under Ignatius, i. 376. Aim at universal monarchy, i. 378. Their Institution a universal conspiracy against Bishops, Princes, and every Power, both spiritual and temporal, *ibid.* Their rapid and amazing increase, *ibid.* 379. Attend the Council of Trent, i. 379. Their zeal against Protestants procures them the protection of Catholic powers, *ibid.* Denounced by Melchior Cano, i. 380. Privileges granted them by Paul III. i. 381. EARLY EFFORTS OF, TO ESTABLISH THEMSELVES IN FRANCE, *ibid.* Protected by Henry II. i. 382. Denounced as dangerous by Eustache du Bellay, Bishop of Paris, i. 383. Their first settlement opposed by the Parliament of Paris, *ibid.* Denounced by the Faculty of Theology, i. 384. Resistance of, *ibid.* DIFFERENT EVENTS RELATING TO, BETWEEN THE YEARS 1554 AND 1560, i. 385. In Portugal, 1555, i. 386. Their first establishment was torn in Portugal, i. 386. Their usurpations opposed by the University of Coimbra, *ibid.* In Sar-

gossa, account of, i. 387. Opposed by the nobility and people of Oporto, *ibid.* In Flanders, 1556, ditto, i. 388. Opposed by the Clergy and Magistrates of Flanders, i. 389. In Rome, 1557, *ibid.* The Generalship of the, made perpetual, contrary to the will of the Pope, i. 391. NEW EFFORTS OF THE JESUITS, IN 1560, TO ACQUIRE A FOOTING IN FRANCE, ii. 1. Favoured by Catherine de Medicis, *ibid.* Success in France, 1561-2, ii. 1, 2. Pasquier and Du Mesnil oppose them, ii. 3. EVENTS OF 1564, AND THE SUCCEEDING PERIOD, ii. 3. By their artful measures triumph over their enemies, ii. 4. In Portugal, 1563, ii. 4, 5. Become Confessors to Kings, Queens, and Statesmen, ii. 4. Persuade the King of Portugal to bequeath his crown to Spain, ii. 5. Expelled from Antwerp, 1578, ii. 6. Their expulsion demanded by the Austrian States, *ibid.* Expelled by force from Vienna, ii. 7. Their gross vices, *ibid.* Their infamous practices in Spain, and Milan, *ibid.* Their persecutions in Savoy, where they cause a war in 1560, ii. 8. Frequently excite the most cruel civil wars, ii. 9. Sweden resists them, *ibid.* AT THE HEAD OF THE LEAGUE IN FRANCE—THEIR CONSPIRACIES AGAINST HENRY III. AND HENRY IV. ii. 11. Massacre two Kings of France, and create a civil war, *ibid.* Their dreadful conduct in France described, ii. 13. Eulogize the assassin of Henry III. *ibid.* Expelled from Bourdeaux for conspiracy, ii. 14. Excite the three assassins of Henry IV. ii. 15. THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS DEMAND THE EXPULSION OF THE JESUITS; AFTER WHICH THEY ARE GUILTY OF FRESH ATTEMPTS ON THE KING, AND ARE EXPELLED THE KINGDOM, ii. 16. Attempt of Chatel to assassinate Henry IV. ii. 17. Gueret and Chatel banished, ii. 18. Expelled France, in 1597, but many Jesuits remain, ii. 19. JESUITS ARE THE AUTHORS OF VARIOUS CONSPIRACIES AGAINST QUEEN ELIZABETH, AND KING JAMES I. IN ENGLAND, AND EXCITE THE GREATEST TROUBLES IN POLAND AND RUSSIA, ii. 20. Engaged thirty years in England to

excite a civil war, *ibid.* Plots against Queen Elizabeth, who discovers their designs, ii. 20, 21, 23. An Act passed against, by the English Parliament, ii. 21. Various plans of, to assassinate Queen Elizabeth, ii. 23. Excite Spain to make war against England, *ibid.* Plots against James I. ii. 24, 25. Though concealed, excite five conspiracies against James I. during the first year of his reign, ii. 24. Jesuits in Poland, abominable conduct of, ii. 26. Attempt to dethrone the Grand Duke of Muscovy, and obliged to fly from Moscow, *ibid.* CONDUCT OF THE JESUITS TOWARDS THE CATHOLIC CLERGY OF ENGLAND: THEY PREVENT THEIR CHURCH FROM BEING GOVERNED BY A BISHOP, IN ORDER THAT THEY MAY GOVERN IT THEMSELVES, ii. 27-31. Their intrigues to convert the Protestants in England, ii. 28. Great disputes at Rome amongst their Delegates, ii. 30. Accused of all the troubles in the Romish Church, ii. 31. AFFAIRS OF VENICE, ii. 32. Banished from Venice, 16c6, ii. 33. Denounced to Henry IV. of France, by De Canaze his Ambassador at Venice, ii. 33. Return to Venice, in 1657, ii. 34. RECAL OF THE JESUITS IN THE KINGDOM OF FRANCE, ii. 35. Struggle of Henry IV. of France, ii. 36, 38. Engaged in every conspiracy against him, ii. 38. Henry IV. resolves for the Jesuits, ii. 39, 40. Their recal opposed by the Parliament, University of Paris, Sorbonne, and many Bishops, ii. 41. Sully on their recal, *ibid.* Assassination of Henry IV. ii. 42-45. Regicides, ii. 46, 48, 50. Their privileges extended by Mary de Medicis, Queen Mother, ii. 47. Blasphemy of Jesuits, *ibid.* Extracts from their blasphemous sermons, *ibid.* EXCESSES OF THE JESUITS AT GENOA, IN STYRIA, CARINTHIA, AND CARNIOLA; IN HOLLAND, SWITZERLAND, BOHEMIA, LOUVAIN, AND POLAND, ii. 50. Their horrible principles and practices, ii. 52, 95. Their sanguinary spirit, ii. 52. Banished from Bohemia, in 1618, but return in 1620, ii. 52-53. Intrigues and villainies in Poland,

1622, ii. 54-58. Reduce the Church of Belgium to a deplorable condition, during 70 years they were at its head, ii. 54. Invite the City and University of Cracow, to the festival of St. Ignatius, ii. 56. Truly portrayed in a letter of the University of Cracow, ii. 58. CONDUCT OF THE JESUITS RELATIVE TO THEIR INTRODUCTION AT BLOIS, AUXERRE, AND OTHER PLACES IN FRANCE, ii. 59. At Chalons, at Charleville, ii. 60. Subtle policy of, ii. 61. At Angouleme, 1622, ii. 62, 63. Set themselves above all laws, even those of honour and probity, ii. 62. At Orleans, ii. 64, 65. THE JESUITS UNDERTAKE THE ERECTION OF THEIR COLLEGE DE TOURNON IN THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS; THE UNIVERSITIES OF THE KINGDOM UNITE TO OPPOSE IT: AFTER USING EVERY KIND OF CHICANERY, THE FATHERS YIELD AT LAST; THEIR SCHEMES TO INVADE THE COLLEGES OF MANS AND MARMOUTIERS IN PARIS, ii. 66. Remonstrance of the Universities of Paris and Valence, 1624, ii. 66, 67. Memorial for Universities, 1624. ii. 68. Fraud at Paris, 1625, ii. 69-71. Fraudulently take possession of the College of Mentz, ii. 70. AFFAIRS RELATING TO THE ADMONITIO, SANCTAREL, &c. AND OTHER WRITINGS OF THE JESUITS HOSTILE TO THE AUTHORITY AND PERSONS OF KINGS, ii. 72. Their ingratitude when loaded with favors, *ibid.* Political libels of, in 1625, ii. 72-74. All their writings hostile to the persons and authority of Kings, ii. 73. Clergy condemn the libels, 1626, ii. 75. Sanctarel's regicide work, 1626, ii. 76. Jesuits examined by Parliament, 1626, ii. 77, 78. Their evasive answer, ii. 78. Protected by Louis XIII. ii. 79, 80. Their unbounded credit with Louis XIII. ii. 80. CONDUCT OF THE JESUITS TOWARDS THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS OF ENGLAND AND FRANCE, AND THEIR ATTACKS UPON THE EPISCOPAL OFFICE ITSELF, ii. 81. Oppose Episcopacy in England, ii. 82-85. In France, ii. 86-88. FARTHER ATTACKS OF THE JESUITS UPON THE BISHOPS, AND UPON EPISCOPACY IN GE-

NERAL IN ALL QUARTERS OF THE WORLD, MORE ESPECIALLY IN THEIR CHARACTER OF MISSIONARIES TO FOREIGN PARTS, AND A VIEW OF THEIR CONDUCT UPON THEIR MISSIONS, ii. 89. Oppose Episcopacy in Holland, 1640-50, ii. 89-90. In Germany, 1618-40, ii. 91-94. Banished from Bohemia the second time, in 1618, ii. 91. Their practice of seizing on the German Universities, ii. 94. Their conduct in America as outrageous as in Europe, ii. 95. Employ their enormous power only to oppress, ii. 97. Oppose Episcopacy in Paraguay, 1644-65, *ibid.* In Mexico, 1645-54, ii. 98, 99. In India, 1550-1750, ii. 100. In Japan, 1580-1640, ii. 101, 102. Their persecution of Mattheo de Castro, ii. 100. Their innumerable crimes, ii. 103. Missions hostile to Piety and Episcopacy, ii. 103, 106. To religion, ii. 107, 108. In India, oppose the Missionaries of the Pope, ii. 104. Their crimes and punishment in China, ii. 108. Attack all the Bishops of Spain, and South America, ii. 109. EFFORTS OF THE JESUITS, IN 1643, TO INTRODUCE THEMSELVES INTO THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS, ii. 109. Their immorality and casuistry, ii. 110-114. Their system of education exposed, ii. 111. Abominable principles exposed by the University of Paris, ii. 111-113. FARTHER PROOFS OF THE ATTACKS OF THE JESUITS UPON EPISCOPACY FOR THE SPACE OF TWO CENTURIES, ii. 115. Further attacks on the Church, ii. 116-123. Their conduct at Poictiers, as stated by Sully, ii. 116. Their rage against Arnould, ii. 118. Profit by the vacillating conduct of the Queen Mother, in France, ii. 119. Make disturbances all over France, ii. 120. Their intrigues impossible to be enumerated, ii. 123. OBSTINACY OF THE JESUITS, IN CONTENDING FOR THEIR CORRUPT MORALITY, IN SPITE OF ALL THE CONDEMNATION WHICH IT OCCASIONED, ii. 124. Their corrupt morality, ii. 125-133. Censure on, by Pope Alexander VII. ii. 125. Procure a Brief in their favor from the Pope to Louis XIV. ii. 131. Notwithstand-

ing reiterated censures, maintain their abominable maxims, ii. 133. Boast that they never change their principles, ii. 134. DIFFERENT EVENTS RELATING TO THE JESUITS, AT THE END OF THE SEVENTEENTH, AND BEGINNING OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, ii. 134. Corrupt morality of the, ii. 135. At Tours, 1625-32, ii. 136. At Nantes, 1662-81, ii. 137, 138. Seize on a parish church at Brest, ii. 139. Their Propositions denounced by the Attorney General of France, 1717, ii. 140. Their creed denounced by the French Advocates to Louis XIV. ii. 141. Louis XIV. defends them, 1713, *ibid.* Duplicity and insincerity, ii. 142. Regicide doctrines of, ii. 143. At Laon, 1736, ii. 144. Their cruelties at Muneau, ii. 145. Shelter vices of their own members, *ibid.* At Davron, 1700-60, ii. 146. Acquire great wealth by the protection of La Chaise and Le Tellier, *ibid.* OTHER EVENTS RELATING TO THE JESUITS IN THE FRENCH AND AUSTRIAN NETHERLANDS; AT LIEGE; IN SARDINIA; IN THEIR MISSIONS IN GREECE; AT CONSTANTINOPLE; IN ITALY; AT VIENNA; IN SPAIN, POLAND, &c. ii. 147. Seek to become masters of Louvain and Douay, ii. 147, 148. Persecute the divines of Douay, ii. 148. Conspire, by false accusations, to exile their opponents, *ibid.* Their cruel treatment of Professor Laleu, ii. 149. Teach false Theology at Douay, *ibid.* At Liege, 1692, their stratagems, *ibid.* Become directors of the Collège at Louvain, *ibid.* Missions of Jesuits, ii. 150, 161. Their niercenary spirit proved by various writings, ii. 150. Ruin the Christians in Japan, *ibid.* In China, ally Christianity with the worship of Confucius, *ibid.* Idolatries in China, 1680-1720, ii. 151. Resist the decisions of the Popes against their Chinese idolatry, *ibid.* Their horrid maxims, *ibid.* Permit their General to give orders and counter orders, ii. 152. Their idolatries in Malabar, *ibid.* Their disputes with the Capuchins of the province of Paris; Missionaries to

Greece, ii. 153. Their numerous disputes in different places, *ibid.* Become universally odious by their crimes, *ibid.* In Aleppo, Syria, &c. 1600-1720, *ibid.* In Austria, 1600-1750, ii. 154. Deprived of their despotic power by the Empress of Austria, *ibid.* Their conduct in Portugal exposed—excite rebellion there, *ibid.* Usurp the sovereignty of Paraguay, *ibid.* Their crimes apparent through all the possessions of Portugal, ii. 154. Banned from Portugal, and refused admission to Genoa, Leghorn, Venice, and Naples, *ibid.* Inquiry respecting, instituted by Maria Theresa, ii. 155. Proved to be enemies to science and literature, *ibid.* Their paralyzing influence, *ibid.* Their petition to found a College in Mexico rejected by the King of Spain, ii. 156. In Poland, 1661-1759, ii. 157. Obtain privileges from King Casimir, *ibid.* Deceive Casimir's successor, ii. 158. The ~~ience~~ granted by King Casimir in 1661 nullified 1759, *ibid.* Invade the rights of the Archbishop and Chapter, and of the Universities of Cracow and Zamoski, notwithstanding their guarantee to do no injury, *ibid.* Want of discipline amongst their scholars, ii. 159. **SUMMARY OF THE ARTIFICES EMPLOYED BY THE JESUITS FOR OBTAINING DOMINION BOTH IN THEIR MISSIONS ABROAD, AND IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AT HOME, *ibid.*** Secular policy, ii. 160. Practise the horrible doctrines of Serapis, *ibid.* Their means of ruling others explained, *ibid.* Their intrigues in the East Indies, ii. 161. Pretend to perform the functions of the Apostles, *ibid.* Endeavour to exclude every other religious order from India and America, *ibid.* Their pretended conversion of heretics false, ii. 162. Excite subjects against their Sovereigns, *ibid.* Discovered to have pledged the crown jewels of France, *ibid.* Occasion great disorders in Poland, Sweden, Muscovy, and Savoy, &c. *ibid.* Abhor and persecute Protestants, ii. 162-163. Seize on the University of Prague, ii. 163. Their principal object, to destroy Protestants and amass money, *ibid.* Evade the orders of the

Emperors of Germany in the seventeenth century, ii. 163. Specimens of their practices to destroy their opponents, ii. 164. Embroiled with Catholics, ii. 164-167. Successively accuse their opponents of Predestinarianism, Bayanism, Jansenism, and Quesnellism, ii. 164. Revive the Bull of Pius V. against Michael Bayus, which had slumbered in obscurity seventy-three years, ii. 166. Their reasons for attacking the Jansenists, ii. 168. Corrupt intrigues, ii. 168-174. Remarkable example of their influence, ii. 169. Disperse the "Apology for the Casuists" in France, and oppose the Bishops who condemned it, *ibid.* Favourite arguments of, ii. 171. Indiscriminately accuse all their opponents of irreligion, *ibid.* Obtain the Bull Unigenitus, by a series of intrigues and artifices, ii. 174. **AN EXAMINATION OF THEIR INSTITUTE, ii. 175.** Avail themselves of Religion to attain their ends, *ibid.* Their Constitution monarchical and despotic, ii. 176. Their manner of attracting others, ii. 178. **CONCEAL THEIR INSTITUTE WITH CARE, ii. 179.** Their secrets alarm the Sovereigns of Europe, ii. 182. Remonstrated against by the Parliaments and Universities of France, *ibid.* **THERE IS NOTHING DEFINITE OR PERMANENT IN THE INSTITUTE OF THE JESUITS; BUT THEY CAN CHANGE IT AT PLEASURE, AND GIVE IT THE PARTICULAR CHARACTER WHICH SUITS THEIR OWN PURPOSE, ii. 184.** Their Institute changeable at pleasure to suit their purposes, *ibid.* **THE SOCIETY, FROM THE NATURE OF ITS INSTITUTE, CAN UNITE TO ITSELF MEN OF ALL ORDERS (PROBABLY OF ALL RELIGIONS), LAYMEN, ECCLESIASTICS, BISHOPS, POPES, EMPERORS, AND KINGS, ii. 186.** Reckon Emperors, Kings, and Bishops, as enrolled in their Congregations, ii. 187. Their danger denounced by Cardinal Noailles, ii. 189. Artifice for extending their influence, ii. 190. Can keep no secrets from their Superior, ii. 191. **THE INSTITUTE FURTHER DEVELOPED, *ibid.*** Society composed of four classes, *ibid.* First class of, *ibid.* Acknowledge

that a Candidate or a Novice is a complete Jesuit, ii. 193. Regulations of, reduce the mind to a state of slavery, ii. 197. Promises exacted by them from their Candidates, ii. 198. Gradations of their initiations, ii. 200. Illusion of their vow of poverty, ii. 201. Novices, their vow, *ibid.* The welfare of their Society, the supreme law, ii. 204. SECOND CLASS OF JESUITS, THE SOLE PROPRIETORS OF THE POSSESSIONS OF THE SOCIETY; WHICH, HOWEVER, ARE ADMINISTERED BY THE GENERAL ALONE, ii. 206. Divisions of, by Moteri, *ibid.* Their vows and practices in contradiction to each other, ii. 207. Their Students rich members of the Society in theory only, ii. 207. The division of them by the Constitution, ii. 208. Duration of their course of study, ii. 209. THIRD CLASS OF JESUITS—SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL COADJUTORS, ii. 210. Coadjutors, their functions and nature of their vow, ii. 211. Can alter their vow at pleasure, ii. 212. Regulations of, respecting their property, ii. 213. FOURTH CLASS OF JESUITS—PROFESSORS OF THE FOUR VOWS, ii. 215. Alone are initiated in the great mysteries, *ibid.* Strictly speaking, alone compose the Society, *ibid.* Choose their General, ii. 216. Their requisites, *ibid.* Mental reservation and deception of, ii. 218, 228. Deceive Pope Paul III. ii. 218. Their vow of obedience to the Pope, a mere mockery, ii. 220. Declarations of the, extract from, ii. 222. Mode of life of their Professors described, ii. 225. Their manner of removing scruples, *ibid.* Chicanery of their Institute, ii. 228. OTHER VOWS—ALL JESUITS CAN BE DISMISSED—DANGER TO STATES, ii. 229. Dress of, regulations concerning, *ibid.* Their Vows in general, described, ii. 230. Their Vows conducive to the plan of universal empire, ii. 232. No one can relinquish the Society without the consent of their General, ii. 233. Mysterious laws of, ii. 235. Dismissals from their Society, how managed, ii. 238. Wickedness and secularity of, ii. 240. Their anomalous character, reflections on,

ii. 242. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SOCIETY IS MONARCHICAL, OR RATHER DESPOTIC; THE WHOLE AUTHORITY, THE ENTIRE PROPERTY, THE GOVERNMENT AND CONDUCT OF THE SOCIETY, ARE VESTED IN THE GENERAL, ii. 244. Society of, its composition and government, ii. 245. Their great extent in 1710, *ibid.* Their manner of corresponding, ii. 246. Their Congregations described, *ibid.* General Congregation of, necessary to alienate Houses and Colleges, ii. 255. Monstrous proposition of their Constitution, ii. 258. Memorial of, to Clement VIII. extract from, *ibid.* Their blasphemy, *ibid.* ALL WHO COMPOSE THE SOCIETY ARE BLINDLY DEPENDENT UPON THE GENERAL FOR THEIR LOT, FOR THE DISPOSAL OF THEIR PERSONS, OF THEIR CONDUCT, AND THEIR PROPERTY; FOR THEIR CONSCIENCE, THEIR DOCTRINE, AND THEIR MANNER OF THINKING ON ALL SUBJECTS, IN ORDER THAT THE SPIRIT OF THE HEAD MAY BE UNIVERSALLY THAT OF THE BODY AND EACH OF ITS MEMBERS, ii. 259. Implicit obedience of, to the General, ii. 262. Their Society admits but of one way of thinking, ii. 266. Can only be confessed by a Jesuit, ii. 267. Extracts from their Constitutions, ii. 268, 269. AN EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN INQUIRIES ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS VAST MONARCHY, ii. 271. Their manner of rendering weekly accounts of their proceedings, ii. 271, 273. Spies, of whom they consist, ii. 273. Declaration of, respecting themselves, ii. 274. Contradictory articles of their Constitution, ii. 276. Their supplications against their General, ii. 280. Resist all reform, ii. 284. ACCORDING TO THE INSTITUTE OF THE SOCIETY, NO AUTHORITY, TEMPORAL OR SPIRITUAL, NEITHER COUNCILS, POPES, BISHOPS, OR KINGS, CAN EFFECT ANY THING AGAINST HER, AS SHE IS ABSOLVED FROM THEIR VARIOUS LAWS, AND FROM ALL DEPENDENCE UPON THEM, ii. 286. Compendium of their privileges, ii. 288. Maxims of, ii. 289. Justify regicide, *ibid.* Refuse obe-

dience to the Parliament of Aix, ii. 291. Extensive powers and prerogatives of, described, ii. 294, 300. Their Summarium—its contents, ii. 295. Anecdotes of their impiety, ii. 297. Their privileges occasion great disturbance, ii. 298. INDEPENDENCE OF THE JESUITS WITH RESPECT TO THE CHURCH, ii. 299. Partially restrained by the Council of Trent, ii. 300. Boast that they evaded the restrictions of the Council of Trent, *ibid.* Apply to Pope Gregory XIII. to re-establish their privileges, *ibid.* Brave the opinion of the whole Church, ii. 306. Destitute of real religion, ii. 307. INDEPENDENCE OF THE JESUITS WITH REGARD TO THE POPES, ii. 308. Forty-five of their Propositions condemned by Pope Alexander VII. ii. 316. Treat the Bulls and Briefs of the Pope with sovereign contempt, ii. 317. Attack the Scriptures, ii. 318. Accuse Innocent XI. of Jansenism, ii. 319. Post placards against Pope Innocent XI. inviting the people to pray for his conversion, *ibid.* Their doctrine of philosophical sin condemned by the Pope, ii. 320. Write numerous books and pamphlets in defence of heathen idolatry, ii. 321. Obtain an edict from the Emperor of China, ii. 322. Detail of their altercations with Clement XI. *ibid.* Defy the Pope in every instance, ii. 326. Cause the death of an Apostolic Visitor in India, ii. 329. Their cruel treatment of the Bishop of Halicarnassus, ii. 330. Refuse obedience to Benedict XIV. *ibid.* Turn into ridicule the Bulls of the Pope, ii. 331. Print a letter against the Pope, ii. 332. Systematically oppose the Roman Pontiffs, ii. 335. THE SOCIETY UNITES WITHIN ITSELF THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF ALL OTHER SOCIETIES, PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE; IT CAN APPROPRIATE TO ITSELF UNDER ITS INSTITUTE, ALL IMAGINABLE RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES; POSSESSING THEM IN A MANNER WHICH GIVES IT THE SUPERIORITY OVER ALL OTHER BODIES, AND WHICH MAY EVEN DIVEST THEM OF THEIR ADVANTAGES, IN ORDER THAT THEY MAY

BE SHARED BY THE SOCIETY ALONE, ii. 335. Their privileges irrevocable, ii. 338. Their chief aim is to become directors of the education of youth, ii. 339. Obtain a Bull from Pope Julius IV. extending their privileges, ii. 340. Instruct their Students to refuse the oaths required by the Universities, ii. 342. Their Constitutions best explain their dangerous principles, ii. 343. Provide a system of espionage, ii. 348. One of its mysteries explained, ii. 351. Obtain the privilege of residing in Japan, to the exclusion of the Dominicans and Franciscans, ii. 353. THE SOCIETY CAN BIND TO HERSELF OTHER INDIVIDUALS AND BODIES, WITHOUT EVER BEING BOUND WITH RESPECT TO THEM; SHE ALWAYS RESERVES THE POWER OF DEALING WITH ENGAGEMENTS AND CONTRACTS ACCORDING TO THE INTERESTS OF HER OWN MONARCHY, AND THE PRESSURE OF CIRCUMSTANCES, ii. 354. Observations contained in their Institute relative to wills, ii. 360. Accused of tergiversation by the Bishop of St. Pons, ii. 361. Are never bound by any agreement, ii. 364. THE SOCIETY IS ENABLED, FROM THE NATURE OF ITS INSTITUTE, TO AMASS, IN THE HANDS OF ITS CHIEF, ALL THE WEALTH, POSSESSIONS, AND OTHER MEANS WHICH ARE NECESSARY TO VIEWS OF THE MOST EXTENSIVE DESCRIPTION, *ibid.* Fraudulently obtain some of the best and richest livings in France, ii. 366. Confessors are obliged unremittingly to insist upon the obligations of benevolence to the Society, ii. 367. Offer for its benefactors 70,000 masses, and 100,000 rosaries of the blessed Virgin annually, ii. 368. Celebrate 30,000 masses and 20,000 rosaries during the life of the founder of a College, or other house, and as many more after his death, *ibid.* Celebrate 480,000 masses annually, *ibid.* Statistical account of their members; their missions, houses, and colleges, ii. 369. Acquired 230,000 livres of annual revenue in thirty years, ii. 370. Complaints against their avarice by Pasquier, Arnauld, M. du Bellois,

Henry IV. and the University of Paris, ii. 370. Their expedients to amass wealth, ii. 371. Their whole history a continued series of spoliation and plunder, *ibid.* Derived 40,000 Roman crowns annually under the head of alms, at Rome, ii. 371*. The extent of their missions in 1594, ii. 371. Reduce the subjects of Uruguay and Paraguay to slavery, ii. 372. Persecute Vicars-Apostolic and their missionaries throughout India and the Christian world, ii. 373. The motives of their policy in persecuting others, stated by the Bishop of Heliopolis, ii. 374. Carry on their commerce under the disguise of merchants, ii. 374-5. Procure from Pope Gregory XIII. the privilege of practising the art of medicine, ii. 376. Carry on the trades of baking, grocery, &c. at Rome, *ibid.* At Pekin lend money at an interest of 25 or 27 per cent. and borrow 10,000 crowns of the Emperor of China to employ in this way, *ibid.* In China proper, obtain an interest of 480 livres per annum, for a loan of 2000 livres, ii. 377. Maintain that it is lawful to gain cent. per cent. *ibid.* THE SOCIETY, IN ORDER TO INDUCE THE MAJORITY OF STATES TO ARRANGE THEMSELVES UNDER HER DOMINION, ATTRACTS THE GREAT AND THE WORLDLY BY PROPOSING THE BAIT OF A MILDER DOCTRINE, A CONVENIENT MORALITY, AND PRINCIPLES WHICH ARE FAVOURABLE TO ALL THE PASSIONS; WHILE AT THE SAME TIME SHE RENDERS HERSELF FORMIDABLE TO ALL WHO REFUSE HER YOKE; BEING FOUNDED UPON A SYSTEM WHICH IS TERRIBLE TO HER ENEMIES, AND HAS MADE EVEN MONARCHS TREMBLE, ii. 378. Their rule of conscience has no other existence than for their own interests, ii. 379. Suit their doctrines to the people they want to proselyte, *ibid.* Permit the idolaters of Malabar to wear round their necks the image of their god, Pilear, provided a crucifix was cut on it, so as not to be discernible, *ibid.* Assume the character of Brahmins, *ibid.* Give the inhabitants of Chio leave to continue Mahometans in public, and Christians in private, ii.

380. In Japan, trample on the crucifix, rather than renounce their commerce, ii. 381. Shape and bend the Scriptures to their own purpose, *ibid.* Permit the commission of every crime, and a life of pleasure and voluptuousness, to their converts and friends, ii. 383. Hold it a dogma of doctrine to kill those who slander them, ii. 385. Agree that the intended assassins of the King of Portugal should not be deemed guilty even of a venial sin, ii. 386. By their intrigues cause the death of many kings and princes, ii. 387-388. Can exercise the office and functions of Inquisitors in countries where no Inquisition is established, ii. 388. Assert that they are neither subjects of, nor amenable to, the secular power, ii. 391. Became masters in Portugal, where they directed the conscience of its princes, and the education of its youth, ii. 393. Have never ceased to exist as individuals, although they have done so as a body, ii. 395. Their revival is not to contend against infidelity, but against the Protestant Church, ii. 396. Their establishing themselves in England inconsistent with the security of the nation, ii. 398.

Jesuits and Catholics are parts of the same great aggregate, i. 9. The legitimate descendants of the ancient Pharisees and Sadducees, *ibid.* Pledged to one common hostility against Protestants, i. 10. Hold regicide lawful, i. 37. ii. 15. Are inseparable, and defend each other, i. 38.

—, English, and Catholic Priests, engage in a league to establish Popery in the reign of Charles I. i. 88.

—, General of the, may falsify by counter-letters what appears ostensibly in others, ii. 152. His universal influence and enormous power, ii. 189, 217. Absolute master of their property, ii. 214. Chosen by the Fourth Class of Jesuits only, ii. 216. Alone appoints Provincials, Rectors, and all the officers of the Society, ii. 249. Appoints the missions, ii. 252. Alone can buy, sell, or manage the property of the Society, ii. 253. Cannot alienate or destroy Houses or Colleges, ii. 255. Alone can con-

voke General Congregations, ii. 256. His great power over individuals, ii. 259. May refuse a request for dismissal, ii. 265. *Jesuitism*, ever dangerous whilst Popery is intolerant, i. 10. Its tendency and principles, ii. 175, 176. *John III.* King of Portugal, anecdote of, i. 377. *Johnson*, Dr. his opinion respecting Hume the historian, i. 110. Convinced of the forgery of Gangarelli's Letters, i. 265. No decisive testimony for Mr. Dallas in favor of the Jesuits, i. 284. Mrs. Piozzi's evidence respecting, *ibid.* Extracts from Boswell's Life of, i. 284, 285. *Joseph*, King of Portugal, attempted assassination of, by the Jesuits, i. 346. *Josephine*, Empress, adulation of, by Pius VII. i. 16. *Jouvenet*, the Jesuit, his curious description of the Parliament of Paris, ii. 141. His panegyric of St. Ignatius, ii. 369. *Juan* and *Ulloa*, two Spanish Catholics cited by Mr. Dallas in favor of the Jesuits, i. 268.

K.

Kelly, Mr. his evidence on the Education of the Catholics, ii. 409. *Kings* of France massacred by the Jesuits, ii. 11 et seq. *Knox*, John, sketch of the history of, i. 167. Eulogium on, by the Earl of Morton, i. 169. And the Congregation vindicated, i. 179. And Luther, resemblance to each other, i. 180.

L.

La Chaise, the Jesuit, his conduct as Confessor of Louis XIV. ii. 172. *Lainez*, the Jesuit, anecdotes of, i. 315. ii. 152. Succeeds Ignatius as General, i. 390. Offends the Roman Catholic Church, i. 392. His tenets become those of the Society, *ibid.* *La Leu*, Professor, cruel treatment and death of, ii. 149. *Lambert*, the Jesuit, forced recantation of, ii. 117. *La Malle*, Lady of, anecdote of, ii. 363. *L'Amy*, the Jesuit, his horrible maxims, i. 235. ii. 130. *Landaff*, Bishop of, his Apology for the Bible, extract from, i. 250. *Lanuza*, severe observations of, on the Jesuits, ii. 266.

La Rue, the Jesuit, singular anecdote of, ii. 242.

Lavalette, the Jesuit, a bankrupt for three millions, i. 301*. Sentence pronounced against, ii. 161. Had half the worth of the property he undertook to convey to France, ii. 375.

Leibnitz cited by Mr. Dallas, i. 284.

Le Joy, Father, anecdotes of, ii. 297. *Leopold*, the chapter of, its complaints against the Jesuits, i. 322.

Lessius and *Hamelius*, Jesuits, censures against, ii. 147.

Le Tellier, the Jesuit, excites enemies against Cardinal de Noailles, ii. 174. And *La Chaise* influence Louis XIV. ii. 148.

Letter of the Bishop of St. Pol de Leon, extract from, i. 16. Of the Bishops of Belgium to the King of the Netherlands, extract from, i. 18. Important one from a Jesuit at Liege to one of Fribourg, i. 63*, 64, 65.

Letters of *Pa'afox*, Bishop of Angelopolis, to *Innocent X.* ii. 124, 182. Extracts from, i. 72, 269*, 300, 312, 330. Of *Courtin* to *Louis XIV.* quoted, i. 105*. Of *Roche*, the Irish rebel Priest, to *Doyle*, i. 124. Of *Doctor Caulfield*, the Popish Bishop, to *Murphy* the Priest, i. 130. From *Kilkenny*, on the bigotry and intolerance of Catholic priests, i. 133. From the county of *Limerick*, i. 134. Of *Tipperary*, i. 135, 137. Of *Louth*, i. 140. Of *Cork*, i. 141. Of *Dr. Clayton*, to *Lord Cromwell*, on the suppression of the religious houses, i. 213*. Of *Joseph Rice* to *Lord Cromwell* on ditto, i. 214*. Of *Ganganelli*, observations on the, i. 265. Of *Sotello* to *Pope Urban VIII.* quoted, i. 314*. Of *Bishop Milner* to the Editor of the *Orthodox Journal*, i. 359. Of *Melchior Cano*, extract from the, i. 381. Of *Arias Montanus* to *Philip II.* ii. 6. Of *Queen Elizabeth* to *Henry III.* extract from, ii. 22. Of *Henry IV.* of France to the *Pope*, extract from, ii. 36. Of *Petrus Aurelius* against the Jesuits, ii. 88. Of the *Archbishop of Utrecht* to the *Pope*, extract from the, ii. 90. From the *Bishop of Nankin* to the *Pope*, extract from, ii. 107. Of *Bishop Gedea* quoted, ii. 167*. Of *Choisuel*, Bishop of *Tourneuay*, to

Pope Innocent XI. quoted, ii. 170.
 On the Roman Catholics, published by the Protestant Union Society, extracts from, i. 133-4-5.
Letters, Provincial, attacked by Mr. Dallas, i. 44, 47. Bossuet and Voltaire's opinion on, i. 47*.
Lilly's History confirms Prynne's testimony, i. 89.
Limerick, blasphemy of a Catholic woman at, i. 136.
Lloyd, Mr. W. F. his evidence on the Education of the Poor, ii. 414.
Lomenie de Brienne, immoralities of, i. 291. Espouses the cause of the Jesuits, i. 292.
Long Parliament, Millar's account of the, i. 93.
Lorraine, Cardinal de, protects Ignatius and the Jesuits, i. 382.
Louis XIV. anecdote of, i. 67*. Refers the Brief of the Jesuits to the Advocates, ii. 131. A Jesuit, ii. 187. Takes the vows, ii. 200.
 —— XV. not imposed on by the Bishops, i. 290. Final Edict of, against the Jesuits, i. 293.
 —— XVI. still continued to be prayed out of purgatory, ii. 10.
 —— XVIII. protestation of, against the Pope's sanction of Bonaparte, i. 15. Too good a Catholic to oppose the Jesuits, ii. 397.
Louvain, complaints of the University of, against the Jesuits, i. 321.
 —— College of, its supplication to Pope Innocent XII. ii. 149*.
Loyola, Ignatius, and the Jesuits, protected by the Pope in opposing the Reformation, i. 371. Biography of, i. 375.
Ludlow's Letters, extracts from, i. 88. Memoirs confirm Prynne's testimony, i. 90.
Luther, his ardour and success, i. 170. And John Knox the Reformer, resemblance of, i. 180. Contrasted with Loyola by the Jesuit Damiatus, i. 371.
Lux, Baron de, deposition of, on his trial, ii. 38.

M.

Magazines, Catholic, supply materials for Mr. Dallas's Defence, i. 52. Observations on the, i. 288. Actively support the Jesuits and oppose the circulation of the Bible, ii. 402.
Malabar, and China, conduct of the Jesuits in, i. 315.

Malagrida and Jesuits, why banished from Portugal, i. 345.
Manfield, Lord, declaration of, relative to De Thou, i. 99.
Mariana, the Spanish Jesuit, moderation of, in his work, ii. 281. Exposes the defective system of the Jesuits, ii. 282. Remarkable similarity between his work and the King of Portugal's Manifesto, ii. 282.
Maria Theresa, inquiry instituted by, respecting the Jesuits, ii. 155.
Marsh, Dr. Herbert, on the spiritual tyranny of the Catholics, i. 24.
Martin, M. on the Commerce of the Jesuits, ii. 374.
Mary of Guise, an account of, i. 165*.
 —— of Medicis, concert the massacre of St. Bartholomew with the Jesuits, ii. 2. Grants further liberties to the Jesuits in France, ii. 47.
 —— Queen of Scots, on her return from France restores Popery, i. 168.
Marylebone, poor Irish in, their ignorance and uncivilized state, ii. 428. Obstacles to their education, ii. 428-429.
Maseres, Hon. Baron, extract from his Edition of Ludlow, i. 88. Ditto from his Select Tracts, i. 90. Ditto from Ludlow, i. 92. Ditto from Sir John Temple's History, i. 117, 118, 119, 121.
Masonic Lodges, abused for vile purposes, i. 63. In France, favor James, ii. 165*. Become schools of scepticism, i. 67.
Massacre of St. Bartholomew, planned and directed by the Jesuits and the Queen Mother Catherine de Medicis, ii. 2*. Actively promoted by the Duke de Guise, *ibid.* Applauded by the Jesuit Guignard, ii. 18. Public thanks for, returned to God by the Pope, i. 308.
 —— Irish, an account of, i. 119.
Masses and Rosaries, curious account of, ii. 368. Only observed by the Jesuits towards those who expend sufficient for the completion of a House or College, ii. 369.
Matheo de Castro, persecution of, by the Jesuits, ii. 100.
Matthieu, the Provincial of Jesuits, an active partisan of rebellion against Henry III. ii. 12.
May confirms Prynne's testimony against the Jesuits, i. 89.

Maynooth College, i. 272. An anomaly in legislation, i. 273.

Melchior Cano, denounced the Jesuits, i. 380. Letter of, extract from, i. 381.

Mental Reservation finds a prominent place in the Vows of the Jesuits, ii. 212.

Menz, the College of, taken fraudulent possession of, by the Jesuits, ii. 70.

Mercenary spirit of the Jesuits proved, ii. 150.

Mezerai, his proofs against the Jesuits, i. 79.

Millar's Historical View, extracts from, i. 93.

Milner, Dean, extract from his History of the Church of Christ, i. 185, 341.

—, Bishop, eulogy on his own clergy, i. 122. Extract from the Pastoral Charge of, i. 357. Complains of Mr. Butler's interference in matters ecclesiastical, ii. 448.

Missions of Jesuits, i. 311. ii. 150. Their extent in 1594, ii. 371.

Molina, the Jesuit, his work described, ii. 305.

Monclar, Mr. facts respecting, i. 76. Extracts from his *Plaidoyer*, i. 321. Observations of, relating to the Jesuits, ii. 172.

Montesquieu, quoted partially by Mr. Dallas, i. 279. Quotations from his work, i. 280.

Moral character, difference between that of the English and Irish, ii. 405. Between the Scotch and Irish, ii. 415. Whence this distinction arises, ii. 415.

Morality the assumed basis of all codes of law, i. 306.

Moreri, his division of the Jesuits into Regents or Masters, and Students, ii. 207.

Moya, the Casuist, defended by Mr. Dallas, i. 238. History and real character of, *ibid*. The horrible tenour of his work, ii. 169.

Muratori cited by Mr. Dallas, i. 284.

Murphy the Irish Priest, his Sermon to the Rebels in 1798, i. 125, 126.

Musgrave, Sir Richard, extracts from his History of the Irish Rebellion, i. 120, 131.

Myconius, Frederic, extracts from his History of the State of Religion, i. 186.

N.

Nankin, Bishop of, his letter to the Pope, extracts from, ii. 107.

National Education, remarks on, by Mr. Dallas, i. 51.

Ney, Marshal, his crime alluded to, i. 84, 101.

Nicholai of Berlin accuses the Jesuits of abetting the new Philosophers, i. 62.

Nicole, his notes on the Provincial Letters, i. 47. Writes against the Jesuit Pitot's *Apology for the Casuists*, i. 234.

Noailles, Cardinal de, opposed by the Jesuit Le Tellier, iii. 173. Approves the work of M. Quesnel, ii. 173. Memoir to the Regent quoted, ii. 188. Denounces the danger of the Jesuits, ii. 189.

Nolac the Jesuit, anecdote of, i. 304.

Norbert, Père, historical memoirs of, referred to, i. 315.

Norris, Rev. Edward, a Catholic Priest, his evidence on the Education of Catholics, ii. 411.

Nouet, the Jesuit, forced to ask pardon on his knees, ii. 118.

O.

Oates, Titus, account of his plot, i. 106. His list of conspirators, *ibid*. Consistency of his testimony, i. 107. Important questions relative to the plot of, i. 111, 112, 113. Plot, reasons for dwelling largely upon, i. 113, 114.

Oath, horrid one of the Catholic rebels in Ireland, i. 127. Prescribed by Pius IV. an account of the, i. 336. Not binding on Jesuit Priests, *ibid*.

Oblations, to Christ's altar, the Blessed Virgin's, and St. Thomas a Becket's, comparative view of, i. 222.

O'Conor, Dr. extracts from his Historical Address, i. 13, 14.

Oliva, General of the Jesuits, his contempt of the Church of Rome, ii. 316.

Oporto, nobility and people of, oppose the Jesuits, i. 387.

Opstraet, Answer of, to the Jesuits, ii. 150.

Orleans, Bishop of, forces Lambert the Jesuit to recant, ii. 117.

— Duke of, Regent, patronizes infidelity, i. 68.

Orthodox Journal, quotation from the, i. 359.

Ossonia, anecdote of the Duke of, i. 101*.

P.

Paganism assimilated to Popery, i. 56.

Palafax, Bishop of Angelopolis, Letter of, to Pope Innocent X. i. 72. 269, 300, 330, 372. ii. 124, 182. His persecutions by the Jesuits, ii. 99.

Pamphlets answered by Mr. Dallas without seeing them, i. 263.

Papal Absolution, an usurpation of the power of the Creator, i. 57. Infallibility, a monstrous doctrine, i. 56. Supremacy, obnoxious to all true patriots, i. 57.

Papists, the, enemies to real science, i. 364.

Paraguay, the intrigues of the Jesuits in, to make it an independent empire, subject to their Society alone, i. 41. The sovereignty of, usurped by the Jesuits, i. 302. Its inhabitants taught the European arts of war by the Jesuits, i. 42.

Paris, Clergy of, their declaration against the Jesuits, ii. 125.

—, University of, their answer to the Apology for the Jesuits, i. 44†, 115*. Reproach the Jesuits with insatiable avarice, i. 297. Charge them with injuring true science wherever they are introduced, i. 320. Demand the expulsion of the Jesuits, in 1594, ii. 16. Their remonstrance against the Jesuits in 1624, ii. 66. Extracts from their Memorial, ii. 68. Denounce the works of Bauni the Jesuit, ii. 113. Expose the abominable principles of the Jesuits, ii. 110-113. On the Oaths of the Jesuits, ii. 345. Extract from their second Memorial to the King, in 1644, ii. 357. Declaration of, in 1724, ii. 270, 342.

Parliament of England, disputes of, with Charles I. i. 90. Pass an act against the Jesuits, in 1585, ii. 21.

— of Queen Elizabeth, their declaration respecting the Jesuits, i. 159.

Parlements of France and various other nations, enumeration of those that have opposed the Jesuits, i. 78. Collect the assertions of the Jesuits, i. 289. Airet for abolishing the Jesuits, i. 290*. Op-

pose the first settlement of the Jesuits, i. 383. Oppose the recall of the Jesuits, ii. 41. Their important interrogatories to the Jesuits in 1626, ii. 77 et seq. Curious description of, by Jeuvenci the Jesuit, ii. 141.

Parliaments and *Universities* of France, remonstrate against the secrecy of the Jesuits, ii. 182.

Parry, the Jesuit, his plots in England, ii. 22.

Parsons, the Jesuit emissary, an account of, ii. 154.

Pascal defended, i. 45. A principal opponent of the Jesuits, i. 234. ——'s Provincial Letters arouse the public to the danger of the Jesuits, ii. 125.

Pasquier, his *Catechisme des Jesuites* quoted, ii. 2*. His elegant harangue against the Jesuits, ii. 3. His *Plaidoyer* quoted, ii. 185. On the Institute of the Jesuits, ii. 199, 206. His designation of the Jesuits, ii. 243.

Pasquinade, one interpreted by Clement XIV. as prophetic of his assassination, i. 267.

Paul, Emperor of Russia, revives the Jesuits in 1801, i. 10.

— III. Pope, founds the Order of the Jesuits, and grants them the most extensive powers, i. 11. Bull of, quotation from, ii. 184.

Pellicanus, his testimony of the ignorance of Europe, i. 186.

Philosophical Sin, Jesuits' doctrine of, i. 245*. Condemned by Pope Alexander VIII. ii. 320.

Pichon, Hardouin, and Berruyer, their blasphemies, ii. 325.

Pigenot, the Jesuit, a furious opponent of Henry IV. ii. 12.

Pilot Newspaper supplies Mr. Dallas with materials for his defence of the Jesuits, i. 52.

Pinkerton, Mr. his Geography quoted, i. 58*. Important extract from, i. 60.

Piozzi, Mrs. errors of, respecting Dr. Johnson, i. 284.

Pirot, Father, his *Apologie des Casuistes* excites public indignation, ii. 126. Condemned by Alexander VII. *ibid.*

Pius IV. Pope, Bull of, quoted, i. 328*.

— V. Pope, Bull of, against Bayanism, ii. 164. Its obscurity creates great confusion, ii. 165. Revived

after seventy years by the Jesuits, ii. 165.

Pius VII. the present Pope, restores the Jesuits, i. 10. Extract from his Bull, *ibid.* Recommends the Jesuits to temporal Princes and Lords, i. 11. His claims to the love and admiration of the world examined, i. 13. Excessive arrogance, fickleness, and time-serving policy of, *ibid.* Inaugurates Bonaparte, *ibid.* Absolves the French from their allegiance to the Bourbons, i. 14. A free agent in his consecration of Bonaparte, i. 15. His adulation of Bonaparte and Josephine, *ibid.* His Concordat regarded as the disgrace and scandal of the Romish Church, i. 16. Reproaches the toleration of the French Government, i. 17. Claims extensive rights of interference, *ibid.* Claims the right of deposing heretical princes, i. 20. Restores the Inquisition, i. 21. His reasons for re-establishing the Jesuits, ii. 396.

Plot of 5th November unitedly the work of Jesuits and Catholics proper, i. 37. ii. 24.

Pluralities of M. Roche-Aimon, i. 291.

Poland, intrigues and villanies of the Jesuits in, ii. 55.

Pombal, Marquis, abused by Mr. Dallas, i. 343. Some account of, i. 345.

Pontius Pilate, and Clement XIV. compared by Mr. Dallas, i. 264.

Pope, the, declared as infallible as Jesus Christ himself, by the Jesuits of Clermont, i. 37*. Compelled by public opinion, to censure the Jesuits in 1665-6, ii. 132.

Popery in Scotland, i. 165, 180. In Europe, i. 184, 208. In England, i. 209, 232. Whilst it is intolerant, Jesuitism will ever be dangerous, i. 10. Unchanged and unchangeable, i. 21.

Popish bigotry and intolerance, proofs of, i. 133 et seq.

— *Plot*, in reign of Charles II. its existence denied by Mr. Dallas, i. 103. Bishop Burnet on the, i. 105. Its object, i. 113.

Porquet, the Jesuit, his doctrines, ii. 324.

Portugal, first establishment of the Jesuits formed in, i. 386. Expulsion of the Jesuits from, in 1759, i. 346. Anecdote of John III. King of, i. 377.

Portugal, King of, his Manifesto against the Jesuits, extracts from, ii. 177, 181, 189, 234, 244, 312, 384. Accusation of, against the Jesuits, ii. 179. Observations of, on their secrecy, ii. 183. Banishes the Jesuits, ii. 154. His letter to the Cardinal Patriarch referred to, ii. 187*. Edict of, against the Jesuits, i. 323. King, Queen, and Statesmen of, have Jesuits for their Confessors, ii. 4.

Poynter, Dr. Roman Catholic Bishop and Vicar-Apostolic of London, his evidence on the Education of Catholics, ii. 439-450. His dispute with Mr. Butler respecting the British Union School, ii. 447-450.

Prague, University of, seized by the Jesuits, ii. 163.

Predestinarianism imputed by the Jesuits to their opponents, ii. 164.

Preston, influence and success of the Jesuits at, i. 335.

Pretext of God's glory, i. 307-310.

Priests' bigotry and intolerance, i. 133-143. Immorality, i. 144-146. Sedition and rebellion, i. 121-132. And Jesuits temp. Elizabeth, i. 149-152.

Probability, the Jesuits' doctrine of, ii. 163.

Processions substituted for vital religion by the Catholics, i. 58.

Prophecy, singular one of the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in 1558, i. 385.

Protestant Union Society, extracts from its publications, i. 133 et seq.

— Persecution vindicated by the Jesuits, i. 37.

— Dissenters defended from the imputations of Mr. Dallas on their loyalty, i. 181.

Protestants, destruction of, the principal object of the Jesuits, ii. 163. With power are tolerant to Catholics, i. 44. Hatred of, the reigning principle of the Catholics, i. 123. Of the County of Cavan, petition from, i. 142. In imminent danger from the revival of the Jesuits, i. 253. Their supineness on the subject accounted for, i. 342.

Protestations of innocence, their negative character, i. 100-102.

Provincial Letters, the author of, at-

racked by Mr. Dallas, i. 44. *Their merit, i. 46. ii. 125.
Proyart, Abbé, declaration of, respecting the Jesuits, i. 51. Supposed to have been a Jesuit, i. 55.
Prussia, infidel King of, observations respecting, i. 260.
Pryne abused by Mr. Dallas, i. 86, 96. Defended, i. 86-89, 95. Important evidence of, against the Jesuits, i. 86. His statement confirmed by other writers, i. 87. ii. 387. His testimony confirmed by May, i. 89. Lord Holles, Husbands' Collection of State Papers, and Lilly's History, Sir John Temple's History of the Massacre in Ireland, Baxter's Life and Times, Whitlock's Memorials, Sir John Berkeley's Memoirs, Clement Walker's History of Independence, Ludlow's Memoirs, and Fairfax's Memorials, i. 89, 90.
Purgatory, its absurdity exposed, i. 57. Dispute relative to the term of its continuance, ii. 10*.
Purgatorial Society, i. 146*.

Q.

Quesnel, his work condemned by Pope Clement XI. ii. 461.
Quesnelism opposed by the Jesuits, ii. 164.
Quigley the Priest, an active promoter of the rebellion in Ireland, i. 122.

R.

Racine, extract from the Ecclesiastical History of, ii. 34.
Rapin, attacked by Mr. Dallas, i. 99. Defended, *ibid.*
 —'s History unfairly quoted by Mr. Dallas, i. 147. Extracts from, i. 111, 114, 150-153.
 —'s State of the Church, extract from, i. 191-195.
Ravaillac, the assassin of Henry IV. character of, ii. 42. His blasphemous confession compared with that of the Catholic Priest of Gorrey, and the Catholic woman of Limerick, i. 136.
Raynal, Abbé, although a Jesuit, cited by Mr. Dallas in favor of the Jesuits, i. 287.
Reason, the School of, Mr. Dallas's assertion respecting its founders, i. 51.
Rebellion in Ireland, an account of the, in 1641. i. 119. In 1798, i. 120, 122. Actively promoted by Quigley, a Priest, i. 122.

Reformation in Europe, i. 184-208. In England, i. 209-232. In Scotland, i. 165, 180. The, principally opposed by the Jesuits, i. 370.
Regicide held lawful by Catholics and Jesuits, i. 37. ii. 65, 289.
Religion designed for perfecting the nature of man, i. 35*. The superstitious abuse of it, i. 61. In France, its secularity, as stated by Robison, i. 69.
Religious Orders (Jesuits excepted) exhibit their rules, ii. 183.
Ricci, Laurence, General of the Jesuits, opposes all reform, i. 289.
Richelieu, Cardinal, cited by Mr. Dallas for the Jesuits, i. 287.
Ridolphus, Robert, sent by the Pope to excite disturbance in England, i. 157.
Robertson, Professor, eulogy on, i. 28. His description of the Order of Jesuits, i. 39. Extracts from his life of Charles V. i. 41. Partially quoted by Mr. Dallas, *ibid.* Observations of, i. 165*. His History of Scotland, extracts from, i. 169, 178, 216.
Robillard, citizen of Tours, anecdotes of, ii. 137.
Robison, Professor, his charge against the Jesuits, i. 63. Extracts from his Proofs of a Conspiracy, i. 68, 69.
Roche-Aimon, M. le, pluralities of, i. 291.
Roman Catholic Bishops of Belgium, their Letter to the King of the Netherlands, i. 17. Threaten rebellion, i. 19. Confound toleration with modern philosophy, i. 20.
 — Church, its Head the centre of a system, i. 9. Its power and wealth proportioned to its superstition, i. 171. An article of its discipline, that the Bible in the vulgar tongue should not be put into the hands of children or the unlearned, ii. 424.
 — Clergy as intolerant as the Pope, i. 17. Their ignorance and immorality prepared the way for the Reformation, i. 171*. Are decidedly against the use of the Bible in the work of education, ii. 402, 406, 407. Object to any extracts being used from the Protestant version, although the passages were *totidem verbis* the same as in the

Catholic version, ii. 402 - 403. Avow that the most profound ignorance and vice are more desirable, in the children of Catholics, than to receive their education from Protestants, ii. 403. Publicly preach against the School in St. Giles's, *ibid*. Threaten the parents to deprive them of their religious privileges if they suffer their children to read the Scriptures, ii. 407. Actively oppose the St. Giles's Free School, ii. 420. Oppose the National Schools, ii. 430, 431. Do not conceive that any plan could be adopted in which they could allow the Scriptures to be taught, ii. 435. Will not allow laymen to explain the doctrine of their Catechism, ii. 440. Oppose all education unless accompanied by instruction in the tenets of their own religion, ii. 437, 444. Deny that the teaching to read the Protestant Scriptures will better the condition of the poor, ii. 446. Object to all religious or moral instruction given by Protestants, ii. 447. Singular conduct of, respecting the British Union School, ii. 454. Refuse absolution to such parents as send their children to the St. Giles's School, ii. 460.

Roman Catholic emissaries plot against Queen Elizabeth, i. 151, 156.

— Priests, their influence much extended by auricular confession, i. 36. Of Ireland, accused of venality and immorality by the author of the "Brief Account," i. 122. Singular method of vindicating them by Mr. Dallas, *ibid*. Their sedition and rebellion, i. 123. Their bigotry and intolerance, i. 133. Their immorality, i. 144. And Jesuits league to establish Popery in England, i. 102.

— Princes protect the Jesuits for their zeal against the Protestants, i. 379.

— Religion, its abuses destructive of all religion, i. 59. Its abuses encourage infidelity, *ibid*.

Roman Catholics, their persecutions contrary to true Christianity, i. 58. Make common cause with the Jesuits, i. 9, 38, 237. ii. 395, 448. Important facts relative to, i. 128*. Their discontent increases with their power, *ibid*. Hatred to Protestants their reigning principle, i.

123. Political power alone proved to be their object, ii. 399. Attack the St. Giles's Free School, and lame the Master's child, ii. 403. Vilify the Bible Societies, ii. 401. Oppose the circulation of the Scriptures, *ibid*. Not influenced by more liberal principles than formerly, *ibid*. Will make no approximation towards the sentiments and feelings of Protestants, ii. 404. Obstacles to their education, ii. 423. In Marylebone, their opposition to education, ii. 430.

Roman Catholics, Irish, their proportion to the Protestants, as 3½ millions to 1½ million, i. 339*.

— and Jesuits, parts of the same great aggregate, i. 9. Compared to the Pharisees and Sadducees, *ibid*. Pledged to one common hostility against Protestants, i. 10. United in sentiment, i. 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39. Intolerant to Protestants, i. 44.

Roman Catholic Emancipation a sophistical phrase, i. 44, 117, 120, 253.

— Schools, i. 362. In London, enumerated, ii. 418. Number educated in the, ii. 425. *Rome*, viva-voce oracles of the Church of, ii. 350. Clergy of, their representation to Pius IV. against the Jesuits, ii. 367.

Rouillet, a seditious Jesuit, ii. 13.

Russel, Lord, confirms the truth of the Popish plot, i. 111. Observation of, on the Popish religion, *ibid*.*

—, Lady, extracts from her letters, i. 112.

Russia, Alexander Emperor of, expels the Jesuits, i. 261. ii. 396.

S.

Sabbath-day, the, ill-observed in Catholic countries, i. 58.

Salicetti, the attestation of, on Clement XIV.'s death discredited, i. 267.

Sammier, the Jesuit, traverses Europe to excite persecution and recommend regicide, ii. 12.

Sanctarel, the Jesuit, the writings of, examined, ii. 76.

Saragossa, conduct of the Jesuits at, and expulsion from, an account of, i. 387.

Sardinia, Jesuits continue to teach

in, after the express prohibition of the King, ii. 150.

Sardinia, King of, interdicts the Jesuits from teaching in his dominions, ii. 150.

Science and Literature discountenanced and opposed by the Jesuits, ii. 155.

Scotland, association of the Reformers in, to resist the tyranny and cruelty of Queen Mary, i. 165.

Scots, Mary Queen of, the instrument of the Catholics against Queen Elizabeth, i. 152.

Scroggs, Sir William, his charge to the Jury on the Popish Plots, extract from, by Hume, i. 115. Charge to the Jury, different account of, by Rapin, *ibid.* Accused of partiality by Mr. Dallas, *ibid.* Impartiality of, in Wakeman's trial, *ibid.* Thanked by the Portuguese ambassador for the acquittal of Wakeman, *ibid.*

Scullabogue, massacre at, in 1798, i. 123. Activity of the Catholic Priests in it, i. 124.

Secreta Monita, Mr. Dallas's account of, answered, i. 326. Published in many places, i. 327. Confirmed, ii. 61.

Sectaries of England, and emissaries of Rome, essentially different, i. 182.

Sedition of Jesuits, i. 302.

Seduction, female, by a Jesuit, defended by the Society, case of, ii. 145.

Seguier, M. Memorial of, referred to, i. 383*.

Serapa, the Jesuit, horrible doctrines of, practised by the Jesuits, ii. 159.

Serry, M. extract from his work, ii. 103. Anecdotes of, ii. 153. Singular assertion of, i. 315.

Servien, M. de, serious charges of, against the Jesuits, ii. 75.

Seville, the city of, defrauded by the Jesuits, i. 300.

Shadwell and its environs, number of uneducated Catholic poor in, ii. 412. State of the children, ii. 413. Wish of their parents to have them educated, *ibid.*

Sharpe, Granville, and Protestant Society, collect proofs of Popish bigotry, i. 133.

Sicilian Vespers, History of the, referred to, i. 310.

Sligo, County of, affidavit from the, i. 354*.

Sotetus, letter of, to Pope Urban VIII. quoted, i. 314*.

South America, conduct of the Jesuits in, i. 41.

Sovereigns alarmed at the secrecy observed by the Jesuits, ii. 182.

Spain, King of, refuses the Jesuits permission to found a College at Maracaibo, in Mexico, ii. 156. Complains to the Pope against the Jesuits, ii. 303.

Stafford, Lord, declared an innocent victim by Mr. Dallas, i. 108. Evidence against, adduced by Burnet and others, *ibid.*

Standish, an English Jesuit, sent to Rome as deputy of the English Church, ii. 29.

State Trials, the credibility of, attacked by Mr. Dallas, i. 114.

St. Bartholomew, massacre of, i. 309. ii. 2.

St. Giles's Free School, publicly preached against by the Catholic Clergy, and attacked by the Catholics, who break the windows, &c. ii. 403. Number of children educated there, ii. 405-408, 419. The nature of the establishment, ii. 406. Admits the children of poor Irish parents of all denominations, *ibid.* Does not interfere with religious opinions, ii. 407. Meets with great opposition from the Catholic Clergy, ii. 406-407. Declaration of the School Committee of St. Patrick's, against, ii. 408*. Beneficial results from it, ii. 409. Its moral effects have been very beneficial both on the children and their parents, ii. 419. Difficulty in extending its benefit, owing to the opposition of the Catholic Priests, *ibid.* No attempts made there to proselyte the children to the Protestant faith, ii. 420.

poor, Irish, number of, uneducated, ii. 404-411, 419. Their general wish to have their children educated, ii. 404. Ignorance and depravity of the parents and children, *ibid.* Their profanation of the Sabbath, ii. 405. Difference between the morals of the English and Irish in that neighbourhood, *ibid.* Their distressed state a hindrance to their education, ii. 420. The moral and intellectual condition of the poor much bettered by education, ii. 421. Their miserable habitations described, *ibid.* Their gratitude towards their benefactors, ii. 423. Their capa-

city for learning fully equal to that of the English or Scotch, ii. 423.

St. Patrick's Charity School, how supported, ii. 410. Admits none but the children of Catholics, *ibid.* Such an exclusion inconsistent with the fundamental rules of the institution, *ibid.** Number educated, ii. 411. Expences of the Establishment, *ibid.*

— Society, extract from the resolutions of, ii. 410*.

St. Paul, observations on, i. 309.

St. Pol de Leon, Bishop of, his letter on the Concordat, i. 16.

St. Pons, Bishop of, accuses the Jesuits of tergiversation, ii. 361.

Stonyhurst College, chiefly belongs to Jesuits, i. 25*. Closely connected with that of Castle-Browne in Ireland, *ibid.* An account of, i. 333, 335.

Sully, Duc de, his conduct towards the Jesuits, i. 80-81. Unfairly quoted by Mr. Dallas, i. 81. Defended, i. 83. Extract from his Memoirs, i. 81, 82, 116. On the Catholics in England, i. 153. His opinion of the Jesuits, i. 258. His advice to Henry IV. ii. 39.

Summ. vium of the Jesuits does not state their secret privileges, ii. 351.

Summary of the History of the Jesuits defended, i. 39, 42.

Sunday School Union, its objects, ii. 414.

— Schools, statistical account of the numbers educated in the, in the metropolis, ii. 415. Number of teachers in the, *ibid.* Their beneficial effects in Wales, ii. 416.

Superstition and infidelity, their close alliance, i. 56.

T.

Tchard, the Jesuit, anecdote of, i. 299. Owed the East India Company of France 450,000 livres, ii. 375.

Tamburini, General of the Jesuits, his reply to the Pope, ii. 151. Duplicity of his conduct, ii. 151, 306. Deceives the Pope, ii. 358.

Temple, Sir John, confirms Prynne's testimony, i. 90. His account of the massacre of the Irish Protestants, in 1641, i. 117.

Tesmond, the Jesuit, in the plot of 5th of November, i. 37.

Theology, false, taught by the Jesuits at Douay, ii. 149. Faculty of, denounces the Jesuits as dangerous, i. 384.

Thomas, St. disgraceful exhibition of, by the Jesuits, ii. 314.

Thoulouse, declaration of the Parliament of, against the Jesuits, i. 48.

Tolendal, Lally, speech of, quoted and refuted, i. 49.

Toleration of Catholics, i. 43. Of the French Government, censured by Pope Pius VII. i. 17.

Tongue's dying statement, i. 112.

Torregiani, Cardinal, bribed by the Jesuits, i. 288.

Tournon, charge of Cardinal de, against the Jesuits, i. 315.

Treasonable doctrines of Becan the Jesuit, ii. 48.

Tridentine Fathers, opinion of, i. 360.

Tumult the true element of the Jesuits, i. 311*.

Turberville's dying statement, in proof of Popish Plot, i. 109.

Typographical accusations, i. 69.

Tyrrius, a Jesuit, sent by Pope Sixtus V. into France to foment the League, i. 79.

U.

Unigenitus, Bull, extract from the, i. 356. ii. 462.

Universities, list of those which have opposed the Jesuits, i. 78. Extracts from the remonstrances of various ones against the Jesuits, i. 66.

— and Ecclesiastics unite in their complaints against the Jesuits, ii. 361.

Urban, Pope, Bull of, referred to, ii. 166.

Usurious conduct of the Jesuits in China, ii. 376.

Utrecht, Archbishop of, extracts from his letter to the Pope, ii. 90.

V.

Valence, University of, its charge against the Jesuits, ii. 67.

Vallory, M. de, important anecdote related by, ii. 190.

Varade, the Jesuit, preaches regicide, ii. 13. Calls the resolution to murder Henry IV. a holy one, ii. 15.

Venetians, the, accuse the Jesuits to the Pope, ii. 32. Banish the Jesuits perpetually, ii. 33.

Venice, affairs of the Jesuits at, ii. 32.

Victor Amadeus, King of Sardinia,

shuts up the Jesuits' Colleges, i. 322. His prohibition despised by the Jesuits, ii. 150.

Vienna, Archbishop of, his complaints against the Jesuits, i. 322.

Villers on the Reformation, important extracts from, i. 44†, 318.

Voltaire, quoted by Mr. Dallas in favor of the Jesuits, i. 47, 279. On the "Provincial Letters," i. 47*. Not an enemy of the Jesuits, i. 53. Detects the forgery of Ganganelli's Letters, i. 265.

Vow of Poverty, discussion upon that of the Jesuits, ii. 202, 220.

Vows of the Jesuits altered at their pleasure, ii. 212.

— and Declarations of the Jesuits in contradiction to each other, ii. 212.

W.

Walsingham, Sir Francis, his account of Queen Elizabeth's Councils, i. 161.

Whitelock's Memorials confirm Prynne's testimony, i. 90.

Wickliff's efforts for the Reformation, an account of, i. 211.

Windebank, Secretary, conspires with others to establish Popery in England, i. 88.

Winter, the Jesuit, in league with Garnett, ii. 23.

Wit and Talent, the confederation of, against the Romish Religion accounted for, i. 56.

Wolsey, Cardinal, his ambition and profligacy, i. 210.

WORKS quoted or referred to.

Actio in Proditiones, i. 115, 147.

Admonitio ad Ludovicum XIII. ii. 73.

Amores Jacobi Marelli è Scriniis Provinciæ Superioris Germaniæ Monachii nuper aper-tis, brevi Libello expositi per Karolum Henricum de Lang, ii. 400.

Anecdotes des Affaires de la Chine, i. 314.

Answer of the University of Cracow, ii. 55.

Answer of the University of Paris to the Apology of the Jesuits in 1644, i. 375. ii. 44.

Anticotton, ii. 47, 65*.

Apology for the Casuists, i. 85.

Arrêt du Parlement de Rouen, ii. 143.

Baxter on Popish Plot temp. Charles II. i. 106.

Bishop of Montpellier's Report to the Assembly of 1656, ii. 167.

Brief Account of the Jesuits, i. 24,

Works quoted or referred to.

ii. 116. *Brief of the Bishop of Chalons*, ii. 167.

Butler's Account of the Formularies, ii. 448.

Catéchisme des Jesuites, ii. 243, 371.

Comptes Rendus, i. 54.

Constitutions cum Examine et Declarationibus, ii. 192 et seq.

Continuation of Fleury, i. 377.

Council of Trent, Resolutions of, i. 19.

Dangereuses Propositions de la Morale, &c. i. 237.

Decima Cleri Secularis in Regno Poloniae defensa contra Exceptiones Patrum Societatis, ii. 59.

Decrees of the Parliament of Rouen in 1631, ii. 71.

Decreta Congregationis, ii. 355.

Défenses de l'Université de Paris, 1632, ii. 71.

Dictionnaire Historique, i. 28, 348.

Discours de l'Assemblée de la Faculté de Théologie, i. 239.

Dissertation Historique et Politique sur l'Education de la Jeunesse, i. 76.

Du Pape et des Jesuites, i. 263.

Edict of the Spanish Inquisition, 1815, i. 21.

Encyclopædia Britannica, i. 40.

Essai Historique sur la Puissance des Papes, i. 20.

Extrait des Procès criminels de Biron et de Bouillon fait au Parlement, ii. 38.

Factum pour les Curés de Rouen, ii. 169.

Foxes and Firebrands, ii. 163.

Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus, i. 379. ii. 14.

Histoire du Maréchal de Matignon, ii. 14.

Histoire du Peuple de Dieu, i. 243.

Histoire Mémorab'le du Procédé qu'ont tenu les Jesuites, &c. i. 307.

Historical Memoirs of the Low Countries, ii. 150.

History of Alphonso de Vargas, ii. 7.

History of the Council of Trent, i. 98.

History of Paris, i. 385.

Jesuites criminels de Léze Majesté, ii. 5.

Jesuites Marchands, ii. 98.

Jesuites, les, tels qu'ils ont été, &c. i. 21, 263-293.

Journal de l'Abbé d'Orsanne, ii. 174.

La Morale Pratique des Jesuites, i. 257, 291, 381. ii. 91, 189, 241.

La Défense de M. l'Évêque d'Angers, et de l'Autorité Episcopale, ii. 121.

La Réalité du Projet de Bourgfontaine demon-

Works quoted or referred to.

trée par l'Exécution, ii. 146. La Somme Théologique des Vérités capitales de la Religion Chrétienne, ii. 81. Les Ecrits des Curés de Paris, i. 235. L'Europe Ecclesiastique, ii. 67. Le Mahometisme toléré par les Jésuites dans l'Isle de Chio, i. 315. ii. 153, 380. Les Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques, ii. 142. Lettre au Cardinal Patriarche, ii. 384. Lettres Annuelles of 1589, ii. 14. Lettres de M. Favre, i. 314. ii. 373. Lettres de M. Couet, ii. 170. Lettre d'un Ministre Portugais, ii. 190. Lettre sur l'Etat présent de la Faculté de Louvain, ii. 170. Lettre sur l'Ordonnance de l'Archévêque de Sens, ii. 121. Letter of the Bishops to Pope Clement IX. ii. 170. Lettre des MM. des Missions Etrangères au Pape, 1700, ii. 171. L'Histoire des derniers Troubles de France, i. 79. ii. 11. L'Innocence et la Vérité défendue, ii. 87. Libri Instituti Societatis Jesu, ii. 180. L'Instruction de M. d'Auxerre, ii. 122. Litteræ Apostolicae, ii. 278 et seq. L'Union desunie, ou les Jésuites dépouillés de la Prévôté de Pignans, qu'ils avoient usurpée, ii. 146.

Mandement contre le Père Pichon, ii. 384. Manifesto of the King of Portugal, ii. 177 et seq. Manuscripts of M. de Talon in the public Library of Paris, ii. 39. Memoir of the Abbé de Juliard, ii. 173. Mémoires des Missions Etrangères, ii. 373, 377. Mémoires Historiques du Père Norbert, i. 314. Memoirs of the Marquis of Pombal, i. 344. Mémoires du Père Norbert, ii. 373. Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclesiastique, pendant le dix-huitième Siècle, i. 268. Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Pères Jésuites, &c. ii. 59. Memoirs on the Formulary, ii. 167. Memorial for the Universities of France, ii. 68. Memorial of the University of Paris, 1724, i. 380. Memorial of the Heir of the Canon, ii. 363. Memorial of the Jésuites of Spain and Portugal to Cle-

Works quoted or referred to.

ment VIII. ii. 258. Mercure François, ii. 54. Mercure Jésuite, i. 392. ii. 36, 280. Montesquieu, i. 71, 279. Mysteria Politica, ii. 72.

Neuvième Ecrit des Curés de Paris, 1659, ii. 86. Nouveaux Mémoires du Clergé, ii. 119.

Observations de l'Université de Paris, sur la Requête des Jésuites, ii. 7. Orthodox Catholic Magazine, i. 52, 359.

Pinkerton's Geography, i. 58-60. Portugal, King of, his Manifesto, ii. 177, 181, 234, 244, 312. Edict of Expulsion, ii. 385. Provincial Letters, the, i. 44. Proofs of a Conspiracy, Robinson's, i. 63-68-69.

Recapitulation des Faits de la Fourberie de Douay, ii. 148. Recueil des Censures de la Faculté, &c. i. 239. ii. 19. Recueil des Décrets de la Première Congrégation, i. 391. Recueils de l'Université de Paris, 1625, ii. 54. Recueil des Mémoires à la Suite de l'Histoire du Cardinal de Joyeuse, ii. 36. Recueil des Nouvelles Lettres, ii. 135. Recueil des Ouvrages de M. de Montpellier, ii. 124. Recueil des Pièces sur l'Histoire du Père Jouvency, i. 257. Recueil des Procès contre les Jésuites, ii. 145. Recueil sur l'Affaire du faux Arnauld, ii. 149. Reflections of a Portuguese, and Supplement to ditto, ii. 312, 358, 371. Relation de la Paix de Clement IX. ii. 170. Remonstrances des Bourgeois et Habitans de Lâon addressées au Roi et au Conseil 1736, ii. 145. Remonstrances au Parlement de Paris in 1603, ii. 20. Reply of the Foreign Missionaries to the Reflections of the Jésuites in 1710, ii. 171. Réponse à deux Requêtes des Jésuites, ii. 243. Réponse à l'Apologie du Père Caussin, i. 297. ii. 374. Report of the Assembly of Poissy, i. 382. Requête au Roi contre les Jésuites de Rheims in 1724, ii. 271, 346 et seq. Requêtes, Procès-verbaux, et Avertissements faits par Ordre de l'Université, ii. 112. Requisitoire des Gens

Works quoted or referred to.

du Roi, ii. 50. Robertson, i. 28, 39, 41, 165, 169, 178, 216. Robison, i. 63, 68, 69. Seconde Apologie de l'Université de Paris, i. 295. ii. 307, 335, 371. Seconde Requête au Parlement de Paris, ii. 357. Secreta Monita, i. 326. Sincérité des Jésuites dans leur Désaveu sur Busembaum, ii. 143. Somme des Péchés, i. 240. ii. 113, 314. State Trials, i. 39. Suite des Mémoires de M. de Villeroi, ii. 24. Suites des Nouvelles intéressantes, ii. 153. Supplication

Works quoted or referred to.

of the College of Louvain to Pope Innocent XII. ii. 149. Théologie, la Morale, des Jésuites, i. 242. Thorn Affligée, ii. 162. Très humble Remontrance et Requête au Roi, i. 295. ii. 372. Très humble Remontrance de la Compagnie à Henry IV. ii. 20. Tuba Magna, ii. 92, 281. Voyage de Duquesne, i. 299.

Z.

Zani, Count, remarkable history of, ii. 239. Quits the religious habit with a vow to return, ii. 240.

ERRATA.

VOL. I.—p. 15, 19th line from bottom, for 1805, read 1806.
p. 25, in note, for *exclusively*, read *chiefly*.
p. 34, 12th l. from bottom, for *Sebtus*, read *Scotus*.
p. 105, 1st l. for *of*, read *to*.
p. 110, 5th l. for *practice*, read *practices*.
p. 148, 16th l. dele the comma after *write*.
p. 194, 4th l. for *passionatly*, read *passionately*.
p. 217, 2d l. from bottom, for *hi*, read *his*.
p. 249, 6th l. from bottom, dele *and*.
p. 329, 7th l. from bottom, for *Secreta*, read *Secreta*.
p. 339, in note, 11th line from bottom, for $\frac{1}{4}$ million, read 1 and $\frac{1}{4}$ million.
p. 344, 4th l. from bottom, for *Malaguida*, read *Malagrida*.
p. 356, in note, two l. from bottom, dele *e* in *sacred*.
p. 382, 5th l. from bottom, for *exclusively*, read *principally*.
VOL. II.—p. 11, for *Auger*, read *Augier*.
p. 117, 7th l. from top, for *now*, read *not*.
p. 174, 11th l. from bottom, supply the word *they*.
p. 306, 4th l. for *INNOCENT X.* read *INNOCENT XIII.*
p. 369, in note, for *præstandum*, read *præstandam*.
p. 379, l. 4, for *for*, read *in*.
p. 393, 8th l. from bottom, for *who*, read *which*.
p. 402, 12th l. from bottom, for *that*, read *this*; and in same page, in note, for *Preface*, read *Address*.
p. 422, l. 9, for *scarcely*, read *scarcely*.

NOTE TO PP. 18—20, VOL. I.

The intolerance and bigotry of the Roman Catholic *Prelates* in the Netherlands appear in a strong light from their own letter to the King, on the 28th of July 1815: but, as some doubts may have been entertained, whether such conduct be agreeable to the present Pope of Rome, it is now necessary to inform the reader that *Pius VII.* has recently sent a Brief to the Bishop of Ghent, fully approving of their proceedings, and “*commend^{ing} the zeal with which they (the Bishops) have defended “the rights of God and the Church.”*—See *Amsterdam Courant*, Sept. 6, 1816.

INTRODUCTION.

It will be found on the fullest inquiry which can be given to the subject, that the Roman Catholics at large, and the Jesuits in particular, are merely parts of the same great aggregate. The Head of the Catholic Church is, as it were, the centre of a system, round which those Catholics who are *not* Jesuits revolve in more regular orbits, while those who *are* Jesuits (like the Comets of the Solar system) describe more eccentric courses. The Jesuits, however, still derive all their heat and influence from the same source out of which the other members of the Catholic Hierarchy are supplied in common with themselves. If the Jesuits, like the fiery stars of our hemisphere, occasionally cross the path of the Catholics, and threaten them with injury or destruction, it is not the less certain that both the Jesuits and the Catholics at large are constituent parts of one comprehensive circle, whose centre is at Rome, and whose circumference is every where. It is therefore to be reasonably expected that until the Papal Church can cordially tolerate a Protestant state, the Jesuits will still continue to be, what they have been from their origin, the most active and formidable of her agents, to whom she will look with confidence for the destruction or humiliation of those who either condemn her religious errors, or oppose her political pretensions. No two descriptions of men could be more opposite to each other, in principles and conduct, than the Pharisees and Sadducees of old; yet they were alike enemies to real Christianity and its divine Founder: in like manner, the Catholics proper, and the Jesuits, although in many things of very opposite sentiments and feelings, are yet mutually

pledged to one common hostility with Protestants of every name, because they are equally agreed in asserting and maintaining such fundamental errors both in Religion and Policy, as Protestants can never fail to protest against, so long as they retain any more than their name.

It was the operation of some such convictions as these which gave rise to the following pages, from which it may perhaps appear that until Popery shall lose her Intolerant character (in which case she must cease to be Popery), Jesuitism will have lost none of her peculiar danger.

The Restoration of the Order of Jesuits took place on the 7th of August, 1814, by a Bull of the present Pope Pius VII. which is well worth consulting: it sets forth the duty of the Pope "to employ all his power to relieve the Spiritual wants "of the Catholic world"—recites the revival of the Order in Russia, in 1801, on the prayer of THE EMPEROR PAUL, and in Sicily, in 1804, on that of KING FERDINAND! it then states that the Pope would "deem himself guilty of a great crime "towards God, if, amidst the dangers of the Christian Re- "public, he should neglect to employ the aids which the spe- "cial providence of God had put in his power, and if, placed "in the bark of St. Peter, and tossed by continual storms, he "should refuse to employ the *vigorous and experienced rowers* "who *volunteer their services.*" It then declares that the Pope, "in virtue of the plenitude of Apostolic power, and "with perpetual validity, had decreed that the concessions "made to the Jesuits in Russia and Sicily should extend to "all his Ecclesiastical States, and to all other States." All necessary powers are then granted to the present General of the Society, "in order that the said States may *freely receive* "all who desire to be, or shall be, admitted into the Order; "and power is granted to the members to apply themselves to "the *education of Youth—to direct Colleges and Seminaries—*" "to *hear confessions; to preach, and administer the sacra-*" "ments;" the several colleges, houses, and members of the Order, and all who shall join it, are then taken under the

protection of the Holy See, which “ reserves the power of “ prescribing and directing all that may be necessary *to conso-*
 “ *lidate the Society more and more; to render it stronger,*
 “ and to purge it of abuses, **SHOULD THEY EVER CREEP IN.**”
 The Society and all its members are then recommended
 “ strongly to temporal Princes and Lords, to Archbishops and
 “ Bishops, and to all persons in authority, who are exhorted
 “ and conjured, **not** only to suffer them to remain unmolested,
 “ but to see that they are treated with all kindness and
 “ charity.” The Apostolic constitutions of the Founder of
 the Order, Pope Paul III.* and others are revived in favor of
 the Jesuits, and in short they are placed in the same condition
 of privilege and power as they anciently enjoyed. The Bull
 is directed to be inviolably “ observed, in all future time, and
 “ *that it shall never be submitted to the judgment or revision*
 “ *of any Judge, with whatever power he may be clothed;*
 “ *declaring null and void any encroachment on those regula-*
 “ *tions either knowingly or from ignorance.*” The Bull of
 Pope CLEMENT XIV. who abolished the Order, is then
 expressly abrogated—and it is lastly stated that “ if any
 “ one shall attempt by an audacious temerity to infringe or
 “ oppose any part of this ordinance, he will thereby incur the
 “ indignation of Almighty God, and of the Holy Apostles.”

The publication of this Bull was followed by an Act
ordaining the restitution of the funds which were the patri-
mony of the Jesuits, and making compensations for their con-
fiscated property.

It was sought to render the above measure palatable to the
 British public, by a laboured vindication of the Order which

* In a Bull of that Pope dated March, 1545, he permits the Jesuits
 to alter, annul, or revive at pleasure as times, places, and circumstances
 might require, their Constitutions made or to be made; and in another
 dated 25 November, 1549, he sanctions the despotism of the General,
 by giving him complete jurisdiction over the members, and power over
 the funds of the Society, together with the privilege of sending any
 Individual of the Order *wherever he might please.*

appeared (together with a copy of the Bull) in one of our newspapers which has the most extensive circulation ! In this apology the measure is stated to “promise more for the “future good of Europe than any event for the last twenty “years.” Europe is represented as “owing infinitely more “than half its civilization to the Popes.” CLEMENT XIV. is called “a weak and imbecile prelate, who was partly flat-“tered and partly menaced into an act of self-destruction in “the abolition of HIS BEST BULWARK, THE SOCIETY OF THE “JESUITS.” It is then affirmed that “the Romish Church “has had ample reason to repent this unfortunate concession; “for HAD THE SOCIETY OF JESUITS REMAINED, THE FRENCH “REVOLUTION AND ALL ITS EXCESSES WOULD NEVER HAVE “OCCURRED.” A negative which perhaps the friends of the Society will have some trouble to prove, but which MR. DALLAS, as will appear hereafter, adopts, and argues upon. The Order is then described as a body of men “set apart for “the propagation and defence of their religion, who (whilst “other Monastics confine themselves to solitary devotion, and “ascetic exercises) inform their minds with learning, and “being thus fit for the business of life, go forth adapted to “every condition to which they may be called.” It is added that “a man who thus unites religion and learning, should be “able to confer the greatest blessings on a kingdom; and that “ALTHOUGH SUCH TALENTS HAVE BEEN ABUSED TO THE WORST “PURPOSES, AND HAVE THUS BEEN ONLY THE INCREASED “MEANS OF MISCHIEF” (no mean admission), “yet that it is a “very vulgar error to argue against the use from the abuse.” There then follows a panegyric on the protection afforded “to “learned men and their writings by the *Convents*,” although it is not clear how this can redound to the honour of those who were not monastics. It is further stated as “natural to “expect that even the clergy themselves should partake of “the errors and ignorance of the dark ages, and very unfair “to object to the priesthood of the present day, what was the “character of the priesthood formerly; the vices and follies

“ in question having been *those of the age and not of their Order.*” This defence is closed by a declaration that “ the Order has been *most heavily slandered, by those who were inferior to them in every good talent;*” and the following question is put in conclusion: “ Are not the enemies of the Jesuits, enemies of our religion in every form?” — An inquiry which leaves no doubt of the Apologist having been *of the same religion as the Jesuits themselves.*

To return to the Pope—It may perhaps be worth considering what claims that Pontiff has acquired to the love or admiration of the world, since his elevation to the Papacy; and how far the act of reviving the Order of Jesuits comes recommended to us by any knowledge we possess of the character of Pius VII. The act itself will be considered more at large hereafter.

On advertiring to the public and political character of this Pontiff, we shall find that his arrogance, sickleness, and time-serving policy are worthy of the darkest ages of Romish superstition. Claiming and exercising the deposing and dispensing powers which his predecessors from the time of GREGORY VII. had constantly practised, he placed the blood-stained Usurper (BONAPARTE) on the throne of the BOURBONS; and in the name of JESUS, he invoked the Holy Spirit in consecrating a sceptre, wrested from its lawful inheritor, by a series of atrocities, flowing from the French Révolution, such as had never before stained the annals of human crimes: he deprived of his crown LOUIS XVIII. the legitimate successor of a long race of Kings, who had been regarded for many ages as the eldest sons of the Church, the founders of all its temporal powers, and the liberal benefactors to whom they owed all their princely possessions. DR. O'CONOR observes upon this — “ Notwithstanding the oaths of allegiance by which Roman Catholics swear, that the POPE has no power over the temporalities of States, the Irish titular Bishops, assembled in Synod at Tallow, so lately as the 6th of July, 1809, extolled as just, holy, and legitimate, those Bulls of Pope

“ Pius VII. by which he absolved all Frenchmen from their
 “ oath of allegiance to the BOURBONS, expressly alienating,
 “ not only the Crown of France, but also the property of all
 “ French loyalists, secular and ecclesiastical, and driving from
 “ their Sees a hundred French Bishops, who were guilty of no
 “ other crime than that of a conscientious regard for their oaths,
 “ and their fidelity to their Prince ; and this too, without stipu-
 “ lating for any compensation—without giving them a trial,
 “ though they demanded it—without granting them that which
 “ was not denied to the Irish, even by CROMWELL.” The Doctor
 quotes Pope Pius VII.’s Bulls, “ *Qui Christi Domini*,” published
 at Rome, November 29th, 1801, and “ *Ecclesia Christi*” of
 August 15th, 1801; against which the Bishops, thus hurled
 from their Sees for their fidelity, appealed. . Their appeal was
 printed and published by DULAU, London, in 1804. DOCTOR
 O’CONOR gives some extracts from these extraordinary Bulls,
 which contain the following paragraph :

“ We desire that the present letters, and all the provisions
 “ contained in them, shall not be disputed, on the ground that
 “ any persons whatsoever, either ecclesiastical or secular, have
 “ not consented to them, or have not been cited, or for any
 “ other reason whatsoever ; and as they emanated from our
 “ proper motives, *and from the plenitude of our Apostolic*
 “ *power*, we desire that they may remain, for ever, valid and
 “ immutable*.”

The Pope could not plead in excuse for this very extraordinary conduct, that he was impelled by fear, or that he obeyed any mandate of the Corsican Tyrant. The following incidents prove the assertion, and shew that he acted with the coolest deliberation : On the 29th of October, 1805, some time previous to his setting out for Paris, he convened a Consistory of the Cardinals at Rome, and informed them, “ that

* See Dr. O’Conor’s Historical Address on the Calamities occasioned by Foreign Influence, signed Columbanus, Part iii. pp. 5, 27 and 36.

“ he cheerfully and gratefully complied with the desire of *his beloved Son in CHRIST* (NAPOLEON) to be anointed with his holy unction by the hands of his Holiness: to be placed by the most solemn rites, performed by his Holiness, in the highest rank; to receive the Imperial Crown by a solemn inauguration from his Holiness, impressing the ceremony with a character of religion, and calling down the benediction of Heaven;” in other words, to cover over the crimes of this upstart tyrant with the broad mantle of hypocrisy; to consecrate, as the zealous and pious supporter of the Holy See, the man who had made a merit with the people of Egypt, that he was the servant of their Prophet—who had marched to Rome to overthrow the Pope, because he had invited the Christians to make war against the Mahometan religion.

Louis XVIII. on the 6th of July, 1804, protested against this usurpation, and the Pope's sanction of it. His protest appeared in the *Moniteur*, and in the newspapers of every country in Europe. Should not this have made his Holiness pause, before he placed this sanguinary tyrant on the throne of St. Louis? On the contrary, he did every thing in his power to prove that this disgraceful deed was the result of cool deliberation; and as if glorying in it, he did his utmost to proclaim it to the world in the most ostentatious manner. On the 26th of June, 1805, some time after his return to Rome, he called together a Consistory of the Cardinals, which is regarded as the most august assembly the Pope can convene or address, and in his Allocution to them he said, “ that he, the Successor of St. Peter, and Vicar of Christ, went to France for the purpose of decorating his *beloved Son in Christ*, *Napoleon*, with the ensigns of imperial dignity; that he assembled them to communicate to them the salutary consequences which, by the blessing of God, had resulted to him from that Journey. What joy, what pleasure, we experienced in our first interview with the Emperor, whose fame has sounded to the extremities of the world, *and whom God has chosen*

“to restore his true religion.”—Again, “The consecration and crowning of the Emperor, and of our dear Daughter Josephine, his august Consort, were celebrated in the most solemn manner.” She was the kept mistress of BARRAS, the Director, who prevailed on Napoleon to marry her in consideration of being promoted in the army.

The CONCORDAT of the present Pope with Bonaparte on the subject of Religion has been always regarded by the Catholic body at large, as the great disgrace and scandal of their Church. The protestations of the various Bishops of France, and particularly the Letter of the Bishop of ST. POL DE LEON on the subject of it, will shew what views have been entertained by his own Clergy, of the course pursued by the Pope in that affair. Their objections to the CONCORDAT were however only drawn from the injury it was likely to do to the Catholic Church and cause, and had no reference whatever to the great question of Toleration between Protestants and Catholics. On this point the Pope is agreed with all his Clergy, and it may be worth considering what the sentiments of the Pope are, especially with reference to the free exercise of religious worship on the part of the Protestants.—Much has indeed been said of the great liberality of the Church of Rome at this moment, and we hear not a little of her intolerant principles having been altogether renounced, or at least greatly relaxed.—The following fact will however prove that even BONAPARTE himself intended greater kindness to Protestants than the present Pope. This Pontiff addressed a formal Letter to all the Cardinals, dated the 5th of February, 1808, containing his sentiments on a proposal of BONAPARTE’s for granting the free and public exercise of religious worship to those who dissent from the Romish Communion, in which he uses these remarkable words—

“ It is proposed that all religious persuasions should be free, and their worship publicly exercised: but WE HAVE REJECTED THIS ARTICLE as contrary to the Canons, and to

“ the Councils ; to the Catholic Religion ; to the peace of human life ; and to the welfare of the State, on account of the deplorable consequences which would ensue from it.”

The other pastoral Letters of the present Pope which are before the Public manifest that this Pontiff declaims against the toleration of Protestant worship as pregnant with the most fatal consequences ; that he reproaches the French Government for its “ protection of Sectaries, Heretics, and Schismatics”—that he considers such an indulgence to Protestants as an alliance between “ Christ and Belial, light and darkness, truth and error, sincere piety and impiety”—that he casts in the teeth of BONAPARTE the ancient maxim of Popery, that there is no possibility of Salvation out of the Church of Rome (“ *Della quale, non vi, è speranza di salute* ”)—that he claims the right to interfere, as of old, “ among all the nations of the Earth” in secular concerns ; and respecting Literary works, Marriages, Bastardies, Divorces, Religious Houses, Vows of Celibacy, Oaths of Allegiance, and the Bishops and Clergy. He expressly condemns the intermarriage of parties, only *one* of whom is a Professor of what he calls “ the Christian faith ;” since the Church of Rome (he says) has always strongly reproved marriages with Heretics, and held them in abhorrence, for which he further quotes the authority of his predecessor Clement XI. ; and again he says, “ the same laws which forbid the marriage of Christians with INFIDELS have also prohibited the sacrilegious nuptials of Catholics with HERETICS *.”

It is a remarkable fact that the present Head of the Romish Church does not stand alone in his abhorrence of Heretics, nor in protesting against the equal toleration of all religions. The Clergy of his own Church entertain precisely

* See the Pope’s several Letters at length in an important Collection of Documents relative to the negotiations between the French Government, and the present Pope, published in 1812, in 3 vols. by Keating and Co. the Booksellers of the English Vicars Apostolic, London, and by Fitzpatrick, Dublin, vol. i. p. 43.

the same sentiments as their Head, and consider, with him, that the very existence of Protestants in a State having the equal right with Roman Catholics of following their own mode of worship, ought not to be suffered.

No sooner had the King of the Netherlands taken possession of his dominions than the Roman Catholic Bishops of Belgium made an effort to re-establish throughout Flanders the ancient dominion of the Church over conscience. Their Letter to their new Sovereign, dated July 28, 1815, is a document of considerable importance: it speaks most unequivocally on the subject, as the following extracts will shew.

“ *Sire, the existence and the privileges of the Catholic Church in this part of your Kingdom are inconsistent with an article of the new Constitution, by which equal favor and protection are promised to all religions.*”

“ Since the conversion of the Belgians to Christianity, such a dangerous innovation has never been introduced into these Provinces, unless by force.”

“ *Sire, we do not hesitate to declare to your Majesty, that the Canonical Laws which are sanctioned by the ancient Constitutions of the Country, are incompatible with the projected Constitution, which would give in Belgium equal favor and protection to all Religions.*”

“ *The Canonical Laws have always rejected Schism and Heresy from the bosom of the Church.*”

“ *The Council of Trent, ALL whose resolutions were published in these Provinces, and have there the force of Ecclesiastical Law, after confirming all the old laws of the Church, which fix the jurisdictions, the rights of the Bishops, of the Chapters, of the Universities, and in general of the regular and secular Clergy, commanded the Bishops to see to the execution of them; and carefully to watch, not only over the maintenance of the sacred pledge of the faith, but also that of the laws which concern the essential discipline of the Catholic Church, and secure the consistency and the inviolability of its Government.*”

It may be here observed that *one* of the Resolutions of the Council of Trent, and the object of the Bull* of Pope Paul III. which issued in consequence, was *the extirpation of Heresy.*

The Bishops proceed :

“ If your Majesty, when you secure to the Belgic Church
 “ her existence and *privileges*, has the intention, as we con-
 “ jecture, *to maintain the entire execution of the Holy Canon*
 “ *Laws*, we are incapable of duly expressing our thanks to
 “ your Majesty for it. But we most respectfully take the
 “ liberty to lay before your Majesty an article of the new
 “ Constitution, which, *in securing the same protection to all*
 “ *Religions, would be incompatible with the free and entire*
 “ *exercise of our official duties.*”

“ We are bound, Sire, incessantly to preserve the people
 “ intrusted to our care, from the doctrines which are in oppo-
 “ sition to the doctrines of the Catholic Church. We could
 “ not release ourselves from this obligation without violating
 “ our most sacred duties : and if your Majesty, *by virtue of a*
 “ *fundamental law, protected in these provinces the public*
 “ *profession and spreading of these doctrines, the progress of*
 “ *which we are bound to oppose with all the care and energy*
 “ *which the Catholic Church expects from our office, we*
 “ *should be in formal opposition to the Laws of the State,*
 “ *to the measures which your Majesty might adopt to main-*
 “ *tain them amongst us, and in spite of all our endeavours to*
 “ *secure union and peace, the public tranquillity might still*
 “ *be disturbed.*”

This is indirectly threatening their Prince with rebellion !

Again the Bishops add,

* The title of this Bull runs thus: “ S. D. N. D. Pauli Divina Pro-
 “ videntia Papæ III. Indulgentia pro pace publica, *et extirpatione Hæ-*
 “ *resum*—Paulus episcopus servus servorum Dei, ad futuram rei memo-
 “ *riam*,” &c. And Pope Clement XIV. admits in his Bull for the sup-
 “ *pression of the Order of Jesuits, that among other objects the Society*
 “ *was founded for the CONVERSION OF HERETICS.*

“ Already the Proclamation of your Majesty, which announced that the new Constitution should insure the liberty of Religion, and give all equal favor and protection, filled every heart with consternation” !!!

In the subsequent paragraphs of this very important document, *Toleration* is confounded by the Bishops with *the modern Philosophy*, one of the characteristics of which the Bishops say is an *indifference to all Religions*.

The inference deducible from the above is, that in the system of the Church of Rome, there is a radical and incurable defect; that her fundamental principle is *hostile to the right which all intellectual beings possess*, of investigating those doctrines, upon the reception of which, *not by an external and forced assent*, but by an internal and unfeigned belief, the present and future happiness of the human race depends; in short, to seek after those solid proofs and valid authorities, which alone, by producing conviction, can effect true conversion. — While the system of Papists will never allow them to compromise, or accord with, such investigations of religious truth, as form the glorious characteristic of the country in which we live, it is manifest that *they cannot but be*, intentionally at least, *tyrants over conscience*.

The present Pope's proceedings against the Gallican Church, and his deprivation of her Bishops, of which acts the most severe complaints were made, form only a part of his inconsistent policy. In his less public correspondence further evidence appears to invalidate his claims to be considered the Father of Christian Europe. In Instructions addressed by him to his Nuncio at Vienna in the year 1805, he maintains the pretended right which the Romish Church has ever assumed of deposing heretical Princes; and he deplores the misfortune of those times which, as he says, prevent the Spouse of Jesus Christ (the Church) from putting those *holy maxims* into practice, and constrain her to suspend the course of her *just severities* against the Enemies of the Faith *.

* See *Essai historique sur la Puissance des Papes*.

The conduct of the same Pope in the affair of the Church of Utrecht was inexplicable even on his own principles. This Church, which was a member of the Body of which he was the Head, applied to him in the most respectful terms soon after his return to Rome, with a view to the interchange of mutual offices of amity between themselves and the Papal See; but their application was only answered by the promulgation of such anathemas against them as were far better suited to another æra than the present *.

It remains to be observed, that if this Pope had never revived the Order of Jesuits, his political imbecilities and theological blunders would have been sufficiently displayed in the circumstance of his having re-established THE INQUISITION —an act worthy of the Pontiff who revived the Order of Jesuits, and well calculated to go hand in hand with that iniquitous measure.

The erection, in our own times, of that monstrous engine of intolerance, tyranny, and bloodshed, the *Inquisition*, would alone have sufficed to stamp the character of its patron, and to transmit his name with execration to the latest times: when we consider, also, that it is more peculiarly as the acknowledged head of an intolerant and persecuting Church, that the Pope has committed such an outrage upon the light and wisdom of the nineteenth century, it will appear that Popery is unchanged and unchangeable: and such a fact may teach us (if we will learn) what we have to expect in England from the tender mercies of that religion, if ever its adherents shall be invested with power.

It will hardly be credited by posterity that the Inquisition could have been revived in this boasted age of liberty and science, without every nation in Europe, and especially our own, having protested, as one man, against the renewal of so much misery as must be consequent upon its re-establishment †.

* See *Les Jesuites tels qu'ils ont été dans l'Ordre politique religieux et morale*, p. 251.

† The Edict of the Spanish Inquisition dated Madrid, April 5th,

If, however, we would see the consummation of Papal absurdity and crime, we shall undoubtedly discover it in THE REVIVAL OF THE ORDER OF JESUITS. The proof of this

1815, will shew what Protestants have to expect from this antichristian scourge of the world, now that it has again reared its blood-stained head: it is entitled the “ Edict of the most Excellent Lord Inquisitor General Don Francisco Xavier Mier y Campillo”—after deploreding the injury which the Catholic Faith had suffered in Spain, the Edict observes, “ it is not strange, that all the lovers of religion should turn their eyes to the Holy Tribunal of the Faith, and hope, from its zeal for the purity of doctrine and manners, that it will remedy, by the discharge of its sacred ministry, so many evils, through the ways and means granted to it by the Apostolic and Royal Authority with which it is invested. Nothing can be more urgent to the truth nor more conformable to our institution; for in vain should we be centinels of the House of the Lord, if we were to remain asleep in the midst of the common danger to religion and our country. God will not permit us thus basely to abandon his cause, nor to correspond so ill to the exalted piety with which the King our Lord has re-established us in the weighty functions of our ministry; in which we have sworn to be superior to all human respect, whether it be necessary to watch, persuade and correct, or whether to separate, cut or tear down the rotten members in order that they may not infect the sound ones.” The Edict, after observing that “ now as well as ever moderation and charity ought to shine forth as forming the character of the Holy office, and that before using the power of the sword granted to us against the contumacious and rebellious, we ought to attract them by presenting to them the olive-branch,” concludes in the following remarkable terms—“ Wherefore, far from adopting for the present, measures of severity and rigour against the guilty, we have determined to grant them, as we hereby do grant, a term of grace, which shall be from the date of the publication of this our Edict, till the last day inclusive of this year, in order that all persons of both sexes who unfortunately may have fallen into the crime of heresy, or feel themselves guilty of any error against which our Mother the Church believes and teaches, or of any hidden crime whose cognizance belongs to the Holy Office, may recur to the latter, and discharge their consciences and abjure their errors, under the security and assurance of the most inviolable secrecy; and on the same being done within the time prefixed, accompanied by a sincere, entire, and true manifestation of all they may know and remember against

assertion must be referred to the following pages: at present it shall suffice to observe that it appears as if Providence, by thus withdrawing the Spirit of Counsel from this mighty Ruler of the Romish Church, would admonish both that part of the world which admits, and that part of it which resists his Spiritual dominion, that a Pope of Rome in our own time is as formidable and dangerous to the liberty and tranquillity of the world as a Pope of Rome was formerly; and that in spite of the pretensions to superior liberality and charity, which Popery may make at this moment, the same system of darkness and intolerance is in full operation, has lost no part of its distinctive character, has grown no wiser from its misfortunes, and has only lifted its head again, for the purpose of

“themselves as well as against others, they shall be charitably received, “absolved, and incorporated into the bosom of our Holy Mother the “Church, without their having thereby to apprehend the infliction of “the punishments ordained, nor the injury of their honour, character, “and reputation, and still less the privation of the whole or any part of “their property: since for those cases in which they ought to lose it, “and the same ought to be applied to the Exchequer and Treasury of “H. M. in conformity to the laws of these Kingdoms, H. M. using his “natural clemency, and preferring the spiritual felicity of his vassals, to “the interests of his Royal Exchequer, exempts them for the present “from this penalty, and grants them grace and pardon whereby they may “retain and preserve the said property, on condition that they appear “within the time prefixed, accompanied with the necessary disposition “for a true reconciliation.” Under this decree, therefore, it is evident that all those Heretics (or Protestants) who did not within the last year abjure their Religion, and embrace Popery, are exposed to the terrors of imprisonment, confiscation, and death;—that neither age nor sex are exempt from the cruel arm of Papal power; but that the Church which from the beginning has been “drunk with the blood of “the Saints,” has in the very instant of her exaltation and revival through the instrumentality of Protestant exertions, rewarded the Protestant Church and cause by the foulest ingratitude, and the most atrocious persecution. “He that hath ears to hear let him hear!”—

desolating afresh the afflicted and exhausted nations of the earth *.

Is this the man who should be courted and coquettled with by the highest authorities of a Protestant State? Or does England, either from ancient History, or recent experience, imagine that she has any thing to gain by offering incense at an altar whose unhallowed fires only excited the indignation and alarm of her Forefathers?

The revival of the Order of Jesuits by the Pope gave occasion, in the summer of the last year, to the publication of "A brief Account" of that Order, the plan of which embraced three parts: viz. 1st, a summary of the history of the Jesuits; 2d, evidences drawn from the history of other nations, and our own, for the purpose of establishing it; and 3d, reflections on the whole subject. The object of this pamphlet was to establish the following positions; namely, that, notwithstanding the pretensions of the Jesuits to superior learning and talents, their Order was only a corrupt modification of the Papal system, and that its members had been at all times the most ardent and active members of the Romish Church—having been by no means scrupulous in the employment of all the means in their power (not excepting PERSECUTION in every form), to swell the triumphs, and enlarge the possessions, of that church—that the constitution and rules of the society obliged its members to a practice opposed to the plainest dictates of religion and good conscience, and hostile to the safety of sovereign princes, governments, and states: that in the two centuries of their existence, the Je-

* DR. HERBERT MARSH, who has lately published a very valuable work on Popery, observes respecting the power of the Pope, "Of this " spiritual tyranny, we freed ourselves at the Reformation, and we " must guard against its entrance *a second time*: we must not forget " that A UNIVERSAL BISHOP is a thing as much to be dreaded as a " UNIVERSAL MONARCH: we must not forget that as universal em- " pire in temporal concerns is subversive of *civil* liberty, so universal " empire in ecclesiastical concerns is subversive of *religious* liberty."

suits were the authors of almost all the calamities which desolated the world at large, and Europe in particular, especially the Protestant part of it: that to doctrines of the most pernicious tendency, both in morals and politics, they had added practices in each, of a nature utterly indefensible: that the agents employed by them in the prosecution of their objects, had been almost exclusively members of the Catholic communion, who had been at all times their willing instruments; and that since the concessions of the present reign (especially the grant of the elective franchise) had greatly increased the number and influence of Catholics, both in England and Ireland, the connexion which had ever subsisted between the Jesuits and themselves, assumed the more importance, as threatening greater danger to a Protestant nation and government: that the circumstance of the Jesuits having now established themselves both in England and Ireland *, in spite of laws which had never been abrogated, appeared part of the system of accomplishing by fraud, what could not be effected by force: that the present Pope, in reviving an Order which was abolished by Pope Clement the Fourteenth, about forty years since, on the petition of the whole of Europe, and in assigning to it, at the same time, the aid of THE INQUISITION (its oldest and best ally), had himself acted upon the great principle of Jesuitism, viz. that the end to be achieved would sanction the means to be employed; and that he had effectually provided for the revival of all the evils inseparable from the employment of such Agents: finally, that the united Parliament owed it to its own safety and to the interests of the Nation at large, at once to dismiss the Jesuits who had actually arrived in England and Ireland, and to prevent the landing of others of the same Profession.

The Pamphlet in question was almost literally a reprint of

* The extensive Collegiate Establishment of Stonyhurst near Preston in Lancashire belongs exclusively to the Jesuits; and a close connexion subsists between that College, and the large Establishment of Jesuits at Castle Browne in Ireland.

Letters which had appeared, in the first instance, in the **TI^ME_S** newspaper, and which had been answered by some Letters inserted in the **PI^OL_ET** newspaper: the latter were soon transferred from the columns of that newspaper to the pages of the **Orthodox Journal**, a Monthly Magazine, published in London by a Catholic Editor, patronized by the Catholic Body, and breathing a spirit of the most bitter and unrelenting hostility towards the Ecclesiastical, Political, and Civil Government of this Protestant nation—but serving at the same time to establish in the strongest way, the liberal and tolerant character of a Church, a Parliament, and a Government, which can all in their turn be content to endure, without resentment or anger, the periodical attacks of the very persons who are reposing in security under the broad shade of their mild and benignant sway!

The Letters in question partake of the character and genius of the work upon which they were thus engrafted. The arguments contained in those Letters would not, of themselves, have rendered any answer necessary; while the vindictive and opprobrious terms in which those arguments were conveyed, would not, upon any recognised principles of courtesy and good breeding, have entitled their Author to a reply.

These Letters were followed by a work of **MR. DALLAS**, entitled, “**THE NEW CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE JESUITS DETECTED AND EXPOSED**,” a title sufficiently extraordinary; because, unless **MR. DALLAS** meant to include in the Conspiracy, the Abolisher of the Order, Pope Clement XIV. and his cotemporaries, all of whom flourished nearly half a century ago (and in which case it is no **NEW** Conspiracy), it is difficult to conceive who these formidable **Conspirators** are, who have thus occasioned so much uneasiness to their assailant.

The Letters in defence of the **Jesuits**, appeared to **MR. DALLAS** as auxiliaries of too much importance to be omitted in his work, and he therefore reprints them in the conclusion of it; by which act, he adopts as his own, the invective and abuse which they contain, and for which it is to be regretted that he

should have thought it necessary to his purpose to have made himself amenable.

It appeared, on consideration of MR. DALLAS's performance, that the course pursued by him throughout the whole conduct of it, would give to any simple refutation of his work the character of a mere controversy by which the ends of truth were not likely to be effectually promoted, and which could hardly be expected, if it stood alone, to interest the public at large; it therefore seemed that for the purpose of establishing, in the first place, the accuracy of the brief "Account " of the Jesuits" already published, a more full and complete history of that Order had become necessary, which might be strengthened by ampler testimonies from various historical sources than could have appeared in a mere summary of their history, while, at the same time, it would be equally necessary to reply to such parts of MR. DALLAS's statement, as might require fuller observations than could be introduced in the regular progress of the history.

The following History will be found to have adopted for its basis and foundation the History of COUDRETTE, although without systematically following that work in all its parts; there being much in the work of COUDRETTE, which would fail to interest an English reader, and would have swelled a volume, before perhaps too much extended, to a still larger compass. It is not among the least honourable testimonies in favor of the work of COUDRETTE (which first appeared in the year 1761), that it had a principal share in leading to the suppression of the Order against which he thus entered his protest in the face of the world: a protest which has to this hour resisted all the attacks of its enemies; and which, in order to be answered effectually, must be divested of the voluminous references to well-known facts, and well-authenticated histories, with which it is at once illustrated and supported.

The exposure of the Jesuits, although the *chef-d'œuvre* of this Author, was not the only work in which he had been engaged against the advocates of Papal intolerance and super-

stitution, having, in an earlier period of his life, written against the celebrated Bull *Unigenitus*, for which he was imprisoned first in the Castle of Vincennes, and afterwards in the Bastille.—The literary research which was necessary in preparing his History had nearly deprived him of his eyesight.

As far as his personal character is concerned, he was universally regarded as a laborious, active, useful, and disinterested Ecclesiastic, and one to whom his own Country in particular, and the world at large, were under considerable obligations *. It is no small testimony in favor of COUDRETTE's History of the Jesuits, that PROFESSOR ROBERTSON has principally founded his account of the Order upon it; since it is well known that he was not accustomed to consult works of equivocal authority, or to be influenced by writers upon whose correctness and veracity he could not depend.—If ever there was a genius who painted for posterity, it was ROBERTSON; and no man was more careful in a general way, in the selection of his colours.

Before MR. DALLAS, therefore, had permitted himself to speak in disrespectful terms of COUDRETTE, it would have been well if he had considered how such an opinion was to be supported. To say nothing of the ability of the author in question; the peculiar merit of his work is, that he has sustained every assertion which he has advanced, with its own proper authority; quoting with the utmost accuracy the several documents to which he refers, and leaving nothing to rest upon his simple and unsupported testimony.—In order, therefore, to invalidate the credit of this writer, MR. DALLAS must at the same time get rid of the concurrent authorities of two centuries: he must not only succeed in discrediting a writer upon whose character for honour and veracity no one has as yet been able to fasten an imputation; but he must also succeed in inducing the world to consign to the same contempt

* See Dictionnaire Historique, and Chalmers's Biographical Dictionary, Art. Coudrette.

a number of faithful Historians both Catholic and Protestant, a variety of Public Acts, Official Documents, Parliamentary Decrees, Royal Proclamations, Papal Bulls, Sentences of Universities, and Mandates of Bishops: nay, further, he must succeed in annihilating the writings of the Jesuits themselves; especially those on the subject of their *criminal casuistry*, which, unfortunately for his argument, are put too plainly and indelibly on record for him either to deny their existence, or to explain away their guilt: he must do more; he must shew that the different nations, societies, and individuals who have, with one consent, stated their grievances and miseries so feelingly and loudly at various periods, from the commencement of Jesuitism till its suppression, were either utterly mistaken upon the nature of their own case, or else engaged in a confederacy which is without a parallel in history, for the purpose of injuring and destroying the most innocent and irreproachable of men, who had no other crime than seeking the instruction and happiness of their persecutors.

MR. DALLAS appears to feel something of the difficulty, if not impossibility, of consigning to the same oblivion which he has destined for COUDRETTE, the "cloud of witnesses" which that writer has produced; witnesses the most unexceptionable; witnesses of different nations; of different religions, of different languages; not acting in concert with each other; living in the very times in which they write, spectators of the various events which they record; and having, for the greater part, no conceivable interest in the invention and propagation of falsehoods which they must know would be refuted as soon as published: the opponents of the Society can in fact afford to spare all that COUDRETTE himself has ever written, so long as his authorities abundantly establish whatever he has advanced.

MR. DALLAS, under a conviction that it would not be enough to lay the ghost of COUDRETTE, unless he could at the same time silence the other spectres which troubled his repose, proceeds with all possible sang-froid to dispose of all the histo-

rians who have presumed to speak evil of the Jesuits; and it is fit that the public should observe, with what a bold and sweeping hand, the grave and reverend authorities of ages are displaced in every instance, where they have borne any testimony against the Jesuits.

A principal object of the following Reply will be to place in its true light this attempt of MR. DALLAS to falsify the recognised facts of history. There is something peculiarly disingenuous and inadmissible in this mode of conducting an argument; but which, fortunately for the interests of truth, carries its own refutation on its front.

In thus extinguishing the lights, and sinking the buoys of history, MR. DALLAS is bound to inform us what he would propose to substitute in their stead. Is the world now for the first time to be left at sea without any better means of shaping its course, than his system would provide? In what other way are we to arrive at a knowledge of the truth, than by an appeal to the evidence of experience, and the records of antiquity? We have, as it were, forced upon our consideration at this time, the phenomenon of a great Catholic Order, once flourishing, opulent, and powerful; afterwards abolished by the accredited Head of the Catholic Faith; and now restored by the same authority: we have absolutely no other means of gaining accurate notions respecting the character of this Order than by a reference to history; we have no other means of ascertaining, whether the Pope, in reviving this Order, has conferred a blessing, or inflicted a curse upon his own Church, upon the Protestant Church, and upon the world at large: we have no other way of coming to a right estimate of the nature of our own obligations, or the extent of his errors.—In this Protestant Country, it will not be taken for granted that a measure is either wise, or good, merely because it originates with the Head of the Catholic Church; because all our experience, both as Christians and as Englishmen, furnishes us with *prima facie* evidence that, on this very account, it will be neither.

If, therefore, we would know whether we should rejoice in the arrival on our own shores, and in the establishment in our own Empire, of these strangers; or whether we should not rather dread and deprecate their introduction, as characters against whom the wholesome statutes and proclamations of our ancestors are yet running; we must refer to history alone for a solution of our doubts. MR. DALLAS, however, virtually denies that the appeal lies to history, in choosing to reject its testimony, and to falsify its assertions: the fact is, that its general voice proclaims too loudly another language than he would have it express; and therefore he would stifle and silence it. Thus, what were facts in other times, are facts no longer—the parties relating them were prejudiced, or interested; they were “Jansenists,” or “Parliamentarians,” or “Enemies of the Jesuits:” those who believed them were credulous, easily imposed upon, and afford no example for our imitation.—If indeed MR. DALLAS can succeed in this object, his end is accomplished.—If he can persuade the British Public to unlearn all that they have ever been taught; to forget all that they have ever read; and to discredit all that they have ever believed; the question between the Jesuits and their opponents is at an end: we may then burn our books, as so much waste paper; and resolve to be wise in defiance and contempt of those means of information by which our humbler ancestors were content to be guided*.

It is, however, worthy of observation, that by a striking inconsistency, not unusual, either with the Jesuits or their defenders, MR. DALLAS will, on all those occasions where he conceives that History may help him, condescend to be indebted

* There were in the Library of the British Museum between two and three hundred printed works on the subject of the Jesuits (to say nothing of MSS.) when the present Catalogue was published; to which Collection, considerable additions have been lately furnished, by a large purchase of Books recently made at Munich under the directions of the present enlightened and indefatigable Trustees and Directors of that valuable Institution.

to her.—If, therefore, he should succeed in discrediting and overturning all the testimony which has been adduced against the Jesuits; upon what better foundation will his own authorities in their favor rest? He has not failed to adduce whatever his industry could collect, in their behalf, from the records of past ages, which he appears to expect that his readers should receive with the most implicit confidence; although some of these testimonies are actually eulogiums of the Jesuits upon themselves (such, for instance, as *Charlevoix*, *D'Avrigny* *, and *Garnier*), and almost all are the testimonies of CATHOLICS. Does he expect that a British public will permit him thus to blow hot and cold with History? Does he think that they will believe History in the few and equivocal instances in which it answers his purpose that they should; but that they will disbelieve it, in the infinite variety of cases where it opposes his opinion?

It is time, however, to revert to THE DEFENCE OF THE JESUITS, BY MR. DALLAS; which it is therefore now proposed to examine in order.

* He was the Apologist of the cruelties in the Palatinate.

REPLY

TO

MR. DALLAS'S DEFENCE OF THE ORDER OF JESUITS.

MR. DALLAS commences his Defence of the Jesuits by complaining that the Catholics are “attacked through the “sides of the Jesuits.” (P. 6.) It is indeed almost impossible to separate them, since they hold many tenets in common, which are dangerous to Protestantism, and the world. In their MORAL CASUISTRY, for instance, as CLAUDE has most ably shewn, in his work on the Reformation, it is impossible to condemn the Jesuits, and at the same time to acquit the Catholics *.

* “ONE CANNOT CONDEMN THE JESUITS WITHOUT CONDEMN-
“ING AT THE SAME TIME THE WHOLE ANCIENT SCHOOL OF THE
“ROMAN CHURCH. For example, the one sort accuses the Jesuits of
“teaching, that it is lawful for one man to rejoice within himself at
“the death of another, and to desire it, not only when it is an evil to
“him who suffers it, but also when it is advantageous to him who
“desires it. But *Guimenæus* shews us that that is exactly the doctrine
“of *Thomas Aquinas*, of *Cajetan*, and divers others, who all maintain
“the same. The one accuses the Jesuits for teaching, that it is but a
“venial sin to be disobedient to divine inspirations: but *Guimenæus*
“shews us that it is also the doctrine of *Aquinas* and *Cajetan*. They
“accuse the Jesuits of teaching, that it is lawful to advise, and at the
“same time to draw in a man to commit a lesser sin, to avoid a greater
“evil; as to persuade a lascivious man to mere fornication, that he
“may avoid committing adultery. But *Guimenæus* proves this to be
“the doctrine of *Cajetan*, *Scotus*, and *Sylvester Prierias*. They accuse

Again; the Catholics and Jesuits are united in sentiment on the expediency of PERMITTING THE COMMANDS AND REQUISITIONS OF THE DIVINE LAW TO BE EVADED UPON THE WARRANT OF MERE HUMAN AUTHORITY; and they thus equally justify a course of life which is entirely at variance with that internal piety which constitutes the very essence of vital Christianity. Their pliant morality accommodates itself to human lusts and passions, with the same facility as that of the Jesuits. What else are the Absolutions, and the Indulgences, the Penances, and Fasts of that Church, and especially its doctrine of Purgatory, but Papal and Sacerdotal Licenses for Sin? If a mere man, or any set of men, may, under color of a commission from Heaven, absolve from punishment for vices that are past, or sanction the perpetration of vices to be committed—if mortification of the body may atone for the sin of the soul; and abstinence from particular food may take rank

“ the Jesuits of maintaining, that a man may not only not remove an
“ occasion or ground of sin from another, who they know will abuse
“ it to that end, but that they may, at the same time, present it to him,
“ and by that means lay a snare for him, to make him fall into sin,
“ provided they do it with a good intention, either to correct his
“ viciousness, or to make him shun some other inconvenience; so that
“ a husband, who is jealous of his wife’s committing adultery, may
“ present her with an opportunity or occasion to commit it; and a fa-
“ ther may lay an occasion in his children’s way to steal from him. But
“ Guimenæus lets us see that this is the very opinion of *Aquinas, Sebatus,*
“ *Navarre*, and of *Cajetan*: I omit an abundance of other beastly cases,
“ which no one can propose without wounding his modesty. They
“ will say to this, it may be, that the Sorbonne has censured that book
“ of *Guimenæus*: but this answer signifies nothing, for we are not con-
“ cerned to know what the Sorbonne holds in these days, nor what it
“ approves or condemns; but to know whether those authors that
“ *Guimenæus* has alleged are well or ill quoted; whether it were not
“ true that those scandalous and pernicious maxims were taught in the
“ school in the days of our fathers, and whether our fathers ought
“ not to have looked on them as evident and certain proofs of a great
“ corruption.” *CLAUDE’s Defence of the Reformation*, vol. i. part i.
ch. 3.

among the essential duties of religion—if men are to be taught that, however they may live, they may yet be redeemed, after death, by the prayers of others, from a state of being, respecting the existence of which, the Holy Scriptures afford no evidence; what can be expected to result from such radical errors, but a system of relaxed morality, or rather of actual immorality, which is the same in kind, if not in degree, with the low and debased ethics of the Jesuits *?

* “ That Religion is chiefly designed for perfecting the nature of man, for improving his faculties, governing his actions, and securing the peace of every man’s conscience, and of the societies of mankind in common, is a truth so plain, that, without further arguing about it, all will agree to it. Every part of Religion is then to be judged by its relation to the main ends of it; and since the Christian doctrine was revealed from Heaven, as the most perfect and proper way that ever was, for the advancing the good of mankind, nothing can be a part of this Holy Faith but what is proportioned to the end for which it was designed; and all the additions that have been made to it since it was first delivered to the world, are justly to be suspected; especially where it is manifest at first view, that they were intended to serve carnal and secular ends. What can be reasonably supposed in the Papacy (where the Popes are chosen by such intrigues, either of the two Crowns, the nephews of the former Pope, or the craft of some aspiring men), to entitle them to Infallibility, or universal Jurisdiction? What can we think of redeeming souls out of Purgatory, or preserving them from it, by tricks, or some mean pageantry, but that it is a foul piece of merchandise? What is to be said of implicit obedience, the priestly dominion over consciences, the keeping the Scriptures out of the people’s hands, and the worship of God in a strange tongue, but that these are so many arts to hoodwink the world, and to deliver it up into the hands of the ambitious Clergy? What can we think of Superstition and Idolatry of Images, and all the other pomp of the Roman worship, but that by these things the people were to be kept up in a gross notion of Religion, as a splendid business, and that the Priests have a trick of saving them, if they will but take care to humour them, and leave that matter wholly in their hands? And, to sum up all, what can we think of that constellation of prodigies in the Sacrament of the altar, but that it is an art to bring the world by wholesale to renounce their reason and sense, and to have a most wonderful veneration for a sort of men,

There is, however, no part of the system of the Catholics in which they are more united with the Jesuits than in the importance which they both attach to AURICULAR CONFESSION; a duty of the Romish Church, which as it has tended, above every other, to extend and keep alive the influence of the Catholic Priesthood on the people, so has it been, in the hands of the Jesuits, the most powerful instrument they have ever possessed to forward their ambitious policy, by enabling them at once to influence the councils of Princes, and to direct the minds of more subordinate agents. “The abolition of Auricular Confession by “the Reformation” (says VILLERS *on the Reformation*), “was a stroke which cut at once the infinite ramifications with “which the hierarchical despotism had every where entwined “its roots, and deprived the Clergy of their enormous influence “on princes and the great, on the women, and in the bosom “of every family:” and in a note on that passage of Villers, the Translator observes, “Of all the contrivances to enthrall “mankind, and to usurp the entire command of them, that “of Auricular Confession appears the most impudent, and the “most effectual. That one set of men, could persuade all “other men that it was their duty to come and reveal to them “every thing which they had done, and every thing which “they meant to do, would not be credible if it were not “proved by the fact. This circumstance rendered the Clergy “masters of the secrets of every family: it rendered them too “the universal advisers: when any person’s intentions were “laid before a Clergyman, it was his business to explain what “was lawful and what was not, and under this pretext to “give what counsel he pleased: in this manner, the Clergy “became masters of the whole system of human life; the two “objects they chiefly pursued were, to increase the riches of “the Order, and to gratify their senses and pride: by using “all their arts to cajole the great and wealthy, and attacking

“who can with a word perform the most astonishing thing that ever “was?”—BURNET’s *Preface to his Abridgment of the History of the Reformation.*

“ them in moments of weakness, sickness, and at the hour of death, they obtained great and numerous bequests to the Church: by abusing the opportunities they enjoyed with women, they indulged their lusts; and by the direction they obtained in the management of every family, and every event, they exercised their love of power, when they could not draw an accession of wealth.”—MILLS’s *Translation of VILLERS on the Reformation*, p. 159.

Again; on the several questions of THE PAPAL INFALLIBILITY* AND SUPREMACY; THE LAWFULNESS OF REGICIDE; and THE DUTY OF PERSECUTING PROTESTANTS; we have constantly seen the Catholics lend themselves to the Jesuits, both in the doctrines which they taught on these heads, and in the practices which they pursued. They have, in fact, been, in every age, the willing instruments of the Jesuits; nor can this be any subject of surprise, when it is considered, that, in the estimation of a sincere Catholic, the interests of *his own Church* are of paramount obligation; and therefore that he has no occasion to be more nice about the means of extending its influence, than the particular Order in question. Hence it was, that although the Jesuits organized the attempt of *Barriere* upon the life of Henry IV. (as is shewn in the following History), it was A RECTOR OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, in Paris, WHO WAS NOT A JESUIT, that first encouraged the design of *Barriere*, concealed the treason from the Government, and sent the traitor to the tuition of the Jesuits, who trained him to their purpose. Hence also, when the Jesuits *Garnett, Gerard, Tesmond, Baudouin, and Hall* (as will be seen in the following History), had contrived the horrid tragedy of the 5th of November, they found instruments fitted to their hands, in *Catesby, Winter, Sir Everard Digby, Rookwood, and Fawkes*; NO ONE OF WHOM, HOWEVER, WAS

* “ The Jesuits of Clermont declared, before all Paris, that *the Pope was as infallible as Jesus Christ himself*, and employed all their knowledge and talents to inculcate that doctrine, and make it an article of faith.” *VILLERS on the Reformation*, p. 384.

A JESUIT, BUT MERELY OF THE SAME CHURCH. The influence of *Catesby*, who was a CATHOLIC PRIEST, upon the minds of the Conspirators was very remarkable; both *Sir Everard Digby* and *Ambrose Rookwood* having publicly declared, after their conviction, that it was from their strong attachment to him that they had at first been led to entertain the project. *Rookwood*, in particular, affirmed, that “ he was persuaded “ and drawn in by *Catesby*, whom he loved above any man, “ and that he had concealed it, not for any malice to the “ person of the King or to the State, but only drawn with “ the tender respect and faithful affection he bare to *Mr. Catesby*, whom he esteemed dearer than any one else in the “ world.” [State Trials, vol. ii. p. 186.] Such, in these instances (among innumerable others), was the conduct of the Catholic Priesthood in reference to the Jesuits; and such was the influence of that Priesthood on the Laity. The system of each remaining the same; the inference is, that Catholic Priests must continue to be the agents of the Jesuits, and that the Catholic Laity will continue their devoted submission to the Priesthood.

MR. DALLAS has therefore no right to complain that the Catholics have been identified with the Jesuits, especially when he considers that *they will not permit themselves to be separated*; that Catholics espouse the cause of Jesuits whenever they are attacked; and appear to feel and act as if they considered themselves mutually interested in each other’s existence and welfare. Thus, no sooner had the Letters against the Jesuits appeared in the *Times* newspaper, than a Catholic Priest (as has been seen) entered into a formal vindication of the Order, in another newspaper; which Defence was immediately republished by the Catholic Editors of a Catholic Journal, who have in all their subsequent Numbers industriously supplied every argument on behalf of the Jesuits, which had been omitted in the Letters; and given higher colouring and greater force to all which had been advanced in their favor.

It might indeed have been reasonably expected, and it

certainly was expected by some sincere friends of the Catholic cause and the Catholic claims, that the members of that Church (at least its English members) would have come forward and disowned the Jesuits, *en corps*, as too bad to be defended. Those Protestants, however, who expected this, knew but little of the spirit and genius of Catholicism: so far from their expectation having been realized, the Catholic body has been remarkably active in its efforts to exculpate the Jesuits. It is easy to understand upon what principle this has happened; the observation of the Lawyers to our Lord, supplies the reason; "Master, thus saying, thou reproachest us also." Whatever may be the reason, however, the fact of the Catholics having chosen to make common cause with the Jesuits is beyond dispute: they have volunteered their best services in behalf of the Jesuits, and so entirely identified their interests with those of the Jesuits, that MR. DALLAS has not the power to separate them, even if the Catholics would thank him for the attempt. If it be true, therefore (as MR. DALLAS deplores), that the Catholics have been "attacked through "the sides of the Jesuits," it must be answered, that the Catholics have chosen to place themselves in the ranks of the Jesuits, and consequently have no right to complain if, in contending on the same side with them, they are taken for the same troops, and adjudged to be fighting for the same cause: "If," as JUNIUS says, "their bed be a bed of tortures, "they have made it for themselves!"

MR. DALLAS proceeds to state that *the Summary of the History of the Jesuits*, published in the BRIEF ACCOUNT, is an unfair and dishonest statement, inasmuch as that portion of it which is in favor of the Jesuits is suppressed; and upon this remark he finds several reflections, which impute to the Author of the *Brief Account* a design of aggravating, by such omission, the description which has been given of this Order by PROFESSOR ROBERTSON, in his History of Charles the Fifth.

The short reply to this charge is, that the Summary in

question was not taken from ROBERTSON's History, but from the ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA; and if MR. DALLAS will turn to the article "Jesuits," in that work, he will find that the passage, with the suppression of which he has charged the author of the *Brief Account*, forms no part of the article from which his Summary was actually taken. So much for the imputation of improper motives!—an imputation which, in every case where it cannot be supported, only recoils upon a writer who resorts to such an argument. If it should be said that the Compiler of the Encyclopædia Britannica had a sinister motive in omitting this exculpatory passage, it may be observed that the testimony which it affords in favor of the Jesuits appears hardly strong enough to warrant the supposition that any person could have intentionally suppressed it; for, to what does it amount? Certainly not to a vindication of the Order, or even to an apology for it as an Order, but simply to an averment that among so large a body of men some individuals were always to be found who were too honest to lend themselves to all the abominations of their fellows; and who can doubt this fact? or who, that is in any degree acquainted with human nature or the world about him, does not know that corruption can never be so general and entire in any society of men (however depraved), as that some will not at all times be found who are an ornament to their own particular body, and afford exceptions to the general rule, which rule, however, they prove by becoming exceptions to it?—Such was undoubtedly the case even among the Jesuits themselves; and, therefore, in asserting that it was so, PROFESSOR ROBERTSON advances a truism, which the Editor of the Encyclopædia Britannica appears to have considered it unnecessary to repeat: it was with the Jesuits *as an Order* that the Editor of the Encyclopædia had to do: it is with the Jesuits *as an Order* that the British Public has to do; and the circumstance of many of their members having been honest men, no more proves that the Order itself was pure, than the fact of there being many excellent Catholics will

prove that the Catholic Church has not fallen into many awful corruptions of doctrine and practice.

It would have been well if MR. DALLAS, while attempting to convict others of intentionally suppressing a passage which he conceives calculated to assist the Jesuits, had not himself suppressed a passage in PROFESSOR ROBERTSON, which it is impossible that he could have overlooked, as it is the continuation of an Extract which he has given: this Extract, so far as MR. DALLAS has chosen to give it, is in favor of the conduct of the Jesuits in Paraguay; but when ROBERTSON arrives at a counter-statement, the pen of MR. DALLAS suddenly stops short, as if refusing the unwelcome office of criminating his friends*. The passage from ROBERTSON in favor of the Jesuits in Paraguay will be found in p. 9 of MR. DALLAS. The following passage *immediately follows it* in ROBERTSON, and in fact forms an essential part of it; although MR. DALLAS shrinks from the offensive truth which it conveys; involving, as it does, a charge upon the Jesuits of having been influenced by motives of ambition and worldly policy, and of having supported their empire by means altogether opposed to the character of preachers of the Gospel of peace.

“ But even in this meritorious effort of the Jesuits for the “ good of mankind, the genius and spirit of their Order have “ mingled, and are discernible. They plainly aimed at estab- “ lishing in Paraguay *an independent empire*, subject to the “ Society alone, and which by the superior excellence of its “ constitution and police, could scarcely have failed to extend “ its dominion over all the southern continent of America. “ With this view, in order to prevent the Spaniards or Por- “ tuguese in the adjacent settlements, from acquiring any dan- “ gerous influence over the people within the limits of the

* “ —We of th' offending side

“ Must keep aloof from strict arbitrement;

“ And stop all sight-holes, every loop from whence

“ The eye of reason may pry in upon us.”

SHAKESPEARE.

“ province subject to the Society, the Jesuits endeavoured to
 “ inspire the Indians with hatred and contempt of these na-
 “ tions ; they cut off all intercourse between their subjects
 “ and the Spanish or Portuguese Settlements; they prohibited
 “ any private trader of either nation from entering their terri-
 “ tories. When they were obliged to admit any person in a
 “ public character from the neighbouring governments, they
 “ did not permit him to have any conversation with their sub-
 “ jects, and no Indian was allowed even to enter the house
 “ where these strangers resided, unless in the presence of a
 “ Jesuit. In order to render any communication between
 “ them as difficult as possible, they industriously avoided giv-
 “ ing the Indians any knowledge of the Spanish, or of any other
 “ European language ; but encouraged the different tribes,
 “ which they had civilized, to acquire a certain dialect of the
 “ Indian tongue, and laboured to make that the universal
 “ language throughout their dominions. As all these precau-
 “ tions, without military force, would have been insufficient to
 “ have rendered their empire secure and permanent, they
 “ instructed their subjects in the European arts of war.
 “ They formed them into bodies of cavalry and infantry,
 “ completely armed and regularly disciplined. They provided
 “ a great train of artillery, as well as magazines stored with
 “ all the implements of war *. Thus they established an
 “ army so numerous and well appointed, as to be formidable
 “ in a country, where a few sickly and ill-disciplined battalions
 “ composed all the military force kept on foot by the Spa-
 “ niards or Portuguese.”—ROBERTSON’s Charles V. Book vi.
 p. 205, edit. 1802.

It is worthy of remark, that ROBERTSON states himself to have been indebted for the above information to *Charlevoix*,

* “ —Who hath not heard it spoken

“ How deep you were within the books of God ?
 “ But you misuse the rev’rence of your place ;
 “ Employ the countenance and grace of Heaven
 “ In deeds dishonourable.”—SHAKESPEARE.

Juan, and Ulloa, who are all reported by MR. DALLAS (p. 25) as “authorities *in favor* of the Jesuits.”

This passage is quoted above merely for the purpose of shewing with what facility MR. DALLAS can suppress facts which are opposed to his own views; while, at the same moment, he is charging upon others a similar practice.

MR. DALLAS intimates (in p. 12), “that the labour of the “author” of the Brief Account of the Jesuits is “*a new attempt against tolerating the Catholic Religion* ;” and he then more plainly argues for the toleration of that Religion, as if any one had ever disputed the propriety and policy of tolerating it, abstractedly considered. He raises, in this instance, a phantom, which he then fights with, and subdues. It has been no where asserted that the Catholic Religion, *per se*, should not be tolerated: but it has been asserted by many of the best and wisest men, both in and out of Parliament, that, if ever that period shall arrive when the members of a Church, which is dependent upon foreign controul, and intolerant towards Protestants, shall acquire the right of exercising legislative or executive functions in this Protestant Realm, the worst consequences alone can be expected to ensue; a proposition which, if it be true at all, assumes tenfold importance from the circumstance of the revival of the Order of Jesuits, a measure of Papal policy, which shews the necessity of increased caution and vigilance, with reference to the Catholic claims, on the part of all who can estimate their own privileges.

Does MR. DALLAS discern no difference between holding fast our own liberties and rights, and invading those of others? Are we therefore intolerant towards Catholics, or recommending intolerance, because we do not choose to give them the right of exercising intolerance towards ourselves? The fallacy of this mode of arguing for the Catholic claims deserves to be exposed, because it is much too common; it is calculated to involve a plain question in obscurity, by an assumption of false principles and a perversion of terms. It is not indeed

peculiar to MR. DALLAS to impute to the opponents of the Catholic claims a refusal to tolerate the Catholics; but the simple fact is, that Protestants, with power in their hands, have not ceased to tolerate Catholics, while it is not to be doubted that, with the same power, Catholics would refuse to tolerate them: the sophism adopted in this reasoning is the same in principle, as that which is conveyed in the terms “CATHOLIC “EMANCIPATION,” a phrase which supposes Catholics to be in a state of slavery. Each mode of stating the question is grounded on a *petitio principii*, by which it is found convenient to assume that to be a fact, which it is well known an opponent will not grant. Since Protestants (argues MR. DALLAS) do not tolerate Catholics, ergo they should alter their conduct: since Catholics (say their other advocates) are in a state of slavery, ergo they ought to be emancipated: neither one nor the other of these syllogisms can be admitted, since the Catholics are free to enjoy their own rights, both civil and religious, and only are not free to exercise such as (if all History be true) would be incompatible with Protestants enjoying theirs; but perhaps MR. DALLAS and his friends would no more admit the validity of an appeal to History in this matter, than on the question of the Jesuits *.

MR. DALLAS next attacks (p. 13) THE PROVINCIAL LETTERS, which he characterizes as “the satirical effusions of a “writer who had espoused the cause of the Jansenists†.” To

* “ And therefore will he wipe his tables clean ;
 “ And keep no tell-tale to his memory,
 “ That may repeat and history his loss
 “ To new remembrance.”—SHAKESPEARE.

† Of the Jansenists something will be said in the following History, where it will appear that Jansenism was merely the watch-word of the Jesuitical party, and that all their opponents were indiscriminately branded with it. At present it shall suffice to notice what Villers has said on the subject in his admirable Essay on the Reformation.

“ The most formidable enemies to themselves, whom the Jesuits “ raised, and the most capable of opposing them, were the Jansenists.
 “ The Jesuits fancied they saw, in the pains taken by the Jansenists to

this it may be answered, that PASCAL is too much above any attack upon his well-earned fame to be injured by this re-

“ propagate and recommend the doctrines of St. Augustin concerning
 “ grace, a plan to bring down the Society, whose principles were not
 “ consistent with those of th.t Father of the Church : but, whatever
 “ may have been the secret design of the partisans of Jansenius with
 “ regard to the Jesuits, it is not the less true that all this controversy
 “ concerning grace was immediately produced by the religious quarrels
 “ which flowed from the Reformation. That terrible shock, which
 “ had separated from the Romish Church a great part of the Christians
 “ of the West, had shaken that Church herself to the very foundation,
 “ and had left within her a leaven and principles of fermentation not
 “ soon to be purged off: the spirit of inquiry, of chicane, and con-
 “ troversy, was also awakened within her. The greater part of Catho-
 “ licis would have been happy to see certain reforms in the Church
 “ herself, certain amendments and regulations with regard to doctrine
 “ and discipline, which were not produced, or not in the manner
 “ which they desired. There were many discontented Catholics. Many
 “ abuses attacked by the Protestants appeared to those Catholics ex-
 “ tremely reprehensible ; and several points of doctrine, controverted
 “ by the former, had induced the latter to think. The council of
 “ Trent had satisfied scarcely any body but the people beyond the
 “ Alps: what concerned the rights of the Pope and the hierarchy was
 “ there carefully settled ; but some essential points of doctrine were
 “ still left in a painful state of uncertainty ; as that of grace, for ex-
 “ ample, which held so important a place in the systems of the Lu-
 “ therans and Calvinists. Baius, a theologian and professor of Lou-
 “ vain, who had been a member of the council, brought the subject
 “ under discussion, and occasioned considerable noise in his time. Af-
 “ ter him, Jansenius, a professor in the same University of Louvain,
 “ followed the same errors, wrote his book, entitled *Augustinus*, was
 “ the friend of the Abbé de St. Cyran, and some other leaders of the
 “ party which was called the Jansenist party from his name. It is well
 “ known how many illustrious defenders this party produced, of
 “ whom Port Royal became the principal seat. The war of opinions
 “ which was lighted up between the Jansenists and the Jesuits, was
 “ the most violent which ever raged within the Church. The Jan-
 “ senists, who in reality had so many opinions in common with Luther
 “ and the other reformers, and were most heartily adverse to the pre-
 “ tensions of Rome, and of the Jesuits, the satellites of Rome—
 “ dreaded, above all things, the reproach of heresy, which was libe-

mark, or to require any vindication. The attempt of MR. DALLAS to depreciate THE PROVINCIAL LETTERS, or to avoid their force by calling them a *Satire*, is a sophism which will not avail the Apologist of the Jesuits: it is true, that PASCAL has, in this inimitable work, availed himself of the legitimate advantages which the talent of ridicule afforded him, “ridendo “ dicere verum;” but the facts advanced by him throughout the work are incontestable, and the Extracts from the writings of the Jesuits, with which it is filled, have never yet been doubted, or denied to be the production of the men whom he exposes and confutes: all the Jesuits cited by PASCAL were considered by their own Order as oracles, and the whole Society always acted so systematically as a body, that the doctrines of the one may be imputed to the rest more fairly than in any other class of men. It is upon the Extracts from the Works of the Jesuits that the logical reasoning and brilliant wit of this admirable work are founded; a work, which at once enlightened the world and immortalized its author. Before, therefore, the credit and authority of THE PROVINCIAL LETTERS can be shaken, the Friends of the Jesuits must succeed in proving that the large and ample quotations from their writings, upon which the whole reasoning of THE PRO-

“ rally bestowed upon them. It became, in some measure, a point of “ honour with them to write vigorously against the Protestants, in “ order to give striking proof that they were as good Catholics as their “ adversaries. At the same time, they wrote at least as vigorously. “ against the Jesuits; and acquitted themselves in this essential office, “ *con amore*, with still more eloquence than in the other. As the Je- “ suits had entered the lists of science and genius with the Protestants; “ their adversaries the Jansenists aspired, in like manner, to shew “ themselves superior to the Jesuits in those very respects in which the “ Jesuits excelled. They composed grammars, books of education “ and piety, treatises of logic, morality, history, erudition. The “ names of Lancelot, Arnauld, Tillemont, Nicole, Pascal, Sully, &c. “ are immortal as the memory of the services which they rendered to “ the sciences and to French literature.

“ Without the Reformation there would have been no Jesuits; and “ without the Jesuits no Jansenists or Port Royal.”—See Villers’s Es- “ say on the Reformation, translated by Mill, p. 387.

PROVINCIAL LETTERS depends, are falsely ascribed to the Jesuits: until they do this, and, at the same time, blot out the admirable notes of NICOLE, they can no more destroy the character of THE PROVINCIAL LETTERS, than they can overthrow the HISTORY OF COUDRETTE, without first annihilating the concurrent History of two Centuries*.

MR. DALLAS, however, quotes VOLTAIRE (p. 14), to shew that “the extravagant notions of a few Spanish and Flemish Jesuits were artfully ascribed by PASCAL to the whole Society”—but the fact is, that PASCAL has selected specimens of Jesuitism from every nation where it was known, and the following History will shew that a French Jesuit and an English Jesuit were by no means more harmless than a Flemish or Spanish Jesuit; their vices having comparatively nothing to do with the nations from which they came, nor the countries where they “laboured in their vocation,” but being the essential vices of the Order, without which it must have ceased to be the Order of Jesuits. MR. DALLAS next quotes VOLTAIRE (p. 14), to shew that so far from the Jesuits having formed a design to corrupt mankind, “no sect of Society ever had, or can have, such a design”—an assertion which is best refuted by the nefarious attempts of the very sect to which

* The lines of LUCAN apply to the labours of PASCAL;

“—————Periere latebrae

“Tot scelerum: Populo venia est erepta nocenti.”

VOLTAIRE himself admits that “the Provincial Letters may be considered as a model of eloquence and humour. The best Comedies of MOLIERE (says he) have not more wit than the first part of them, and the sublimity of the latter part of them is equal to any thing in BOSSUET”—and this passage from VOLTAIRE stands in immediate connexion with that which MR. DALLAS has quoted! Again, VOLTAIRE, speaking of PASCAL’s work, says, “Examples of all the various species of eloquence are to be found in it: though it has now been written above a hundred years, yet not a single word occurs in it savouring of that vicissitude to which living Languages are so subject. BOSSUET being asked what work he would wish most to be the author of, supposing his own performances set aside, replied, “THE PROVINCIAL LETTERS.”

VOLTAIRE himself belonged, to corrupt mankind upon the largest scale which infidelity and profligacy ever attempted.

In p. 14, the charge of fabrication and forgery on the part of the opponents of the Jesuits is pretty distinctly conveyed in the following terms:—"With such enemies as the "Jansenists, will it be thought extraordinary that a thousand "fabrications of those days, blackening the Jesuits, may be "referred to? With such enemies as in later years appeared "against them, in the host of Philosophers and Jacobins, is "it wonderful that there should be modern forgeries?" If this passage has any meaning, it can only imply that ancient authorities must be considered as fabrications, and modern ones as forgeries, when they happen to bear upon the Jesuits; and the passage in question affords a fine example of that species of logic which assumes a fact by interrogation, and proves it by implication.

It would be well if MR. DALLAS had been able to authenticate a single instance of either ancient or modern forgery: he only adduces one—namely the *Comptes Rendus*; which he has, however, entirely failed in establishing as a forgery, as will be hereafter shewn.

One word also, once for all, respecting "*the Enemies of the Jesuits*"—With MR. DALLAS every opponent is only an opponent because he is an Enemy, and no Enemy is to be believed. The imputation of hostility, in order to the invalidation of evidence, is an old *ruse-de-guerre* of the Jesuits and their friends. When the Parliament of Thoulouse declared against the Jesuits, they appealed from their decision, alleging "*que le dit Parlement porte de la haine aux Jesuites*." It is impossible to conceive a more convenient and summary mode of disposing of evidence. If applied to the criminal Jurisprudence of the country, it would form a prisoner's standing Defence; for, no doubt, the Prosecutor is generally the enemy of the Prisoner, and therefore, upon the same principle, ought not to be heard against him; but how did the Prosecutor happen to become so? most probably from the

previous conduct of the Prisoner. How did it happen that such an excellent and exemplary Order of men as MR. DALLAS represents the Jesuits to be, had the misfortune to make enemies of almost all the world, except from their own delinquencies? We see to what length the argument of permitting no enemies to be heard has carried MR. DALLAS, when he gravely rejects (page 12 of Preface) the concurrent testimony of "*the University and Parliaments of France*" for two hundred years, upon no better plea than that they were enemies of the Order. He applies the same test in innumerable other instances: but it seems an expedient not much unlike that to which a culprit once resorted; who challenged all his Jury in turn, in the hope that, by objecting to the whole, he should escape a trial.

In p. 15 we have a testimony from the pen of M. LALLY TOLENDAL, to the influence of the Jesuits in keeping the passions "of the savage populace" within due bounds, and preserving subordination in the world; which is best refuted by a reference to their conduct in every nation, and especially in France, during the time of the League, as detailed at large in the following History: but as that remark is introductory to many others of the same class, and as MR. DALLAS's main argument throughout his work is, that the opponents of the Jesuits were Infidels, Philosophers, and Jacobins, and that if the Jesuits had never been suppressed, the French Revolution would never have happened, it may be as well to consider that argument in this place, once for all.

In order to shew that MR. DALLAS has not been misunderstood in supposing him to advance these propositions, it may be right to recapitulate the passages which record his sentiments.

P. 12 of Preface—"The imposing appearance which the "ingenious agents of Jacobinism had given to the hue and "cry raised against the Jesuits"—Page 15 of the work, "The "destruction of the Jesuits remotely encouraged the forma- "tion of sanguinary clubs by causing the withdrawing of all

“ religious and prudent congregations in which the savage po-
“ pulace of the Fauxbourg St. Antoine were tamed by the
“ disciples of an Ignatius and a Xavier.”

P. 24. “ The two principal authorities quoted by Robertson
“ were leaders on of the Jacobinical Philosophy and of the
“ French Revolution.”

P. 25. “ To men who have recovered from the stun of
“ Jacobinism, it is hardly necessary to say that the destruc-
“ tion of the Jesuits was of the first importance to the suc-
“ cess of D'ALEMBERT and DIDEROT's philosophical reform
“ of human nature.”

P. 28. “ The ingenious Atheists who were preparing
“ France for the age of reason, the liberty of Jacobinism, and
“ the murders of philosophy.”

P. 32. “ There long existed a conspiracy against a So-
“ ciety whose principles and energy awed infidelity and rebel-
“ lion.”

P. 95. “ The late French pamphlets against the Jesuits
“ are the dying echoes of the *Jansenists, Parliamentarians,*
“ and *Jacobins.*”

P. 110. “ A Society to whom it was doubtful whether
“ religion or science were more indebted.”

P. 111. “ Why is the re-establishment of the Society de-
“ manded? From a hope that they may counteract the evils
“ which the neglect of religious education has suffered to
“ spread over the world, and from a conviction that they were
“ put down by the disciples of a false philosophy combining
“ with the vilest of passions.”

P. 120. “ GANGANELLI defrauded the tiara, and helped
“ to prepare the French Revolution.”

P. 129. “ The growth of one generation sufficed to strip
“ the tiara of the veneration *due to it* *, and to threaten every

* If this be not arguing like a Catholic, what is? Protestants know nothing of any “ veneration due” to the Pope. THEIR whole system is founded on the denial of his authority !

“ crown in Europe with ruin. In 1773 CLEMENT XIV. abolished the Order. In 1793 a King of France was beheaded.”

P. 135. “ The Abbé Proyart” (who by the way was generally understood to be a Jesuit) “ says, ‘ The destruction of the Jesuits was the ruin of the precious edifice of national education, and gave a general shock to public morality.’ ”

P. 174. “ The destroyers not only of this religious Order, but of religion itself and of social order.”

P. 203. “ The real value of the Jesuits’ system is proved by the miserable state of degradation into which public education and public morals have sunk in Catholic countries since its utter suppression.”

P. 210. “ If the antichristian Conspirators first doomed the Jesuits to annihilation, it was because their schools were widely diffused throughout Europe, and were marked by them as hot-beds of every thing which they chose to term fanaticism, bigotry, and superstition; that is to say, zeal, faith, and devotion.”

P. 237. “ The founders of the modern School of Reason could not endure men who preached doctrines and maintained principles so opposite to their own new-fangled systems. They knew that respect for revealed truths and reverence for established authority, the two objects of their detestation, were the main points on which the whole system of the education of the Jesuits turned. Fear God and honour the King, was their adopted maxim; religion and loyalty were never disunited by them, and the revolutionary conspirators had determined to subvert both.”

P. 244. “ The Catholic Princes, in discarding the Jesuits, opened volcanoes beneath their thrones.”

“ The destruction of the Jesuits was literally the destruction of that education, in Catholic countries, by which order was established on its best and surest foundation, the belief of future rewards and punishments.”

P. 247. The explosion of the French Revolution is attributed "to the deistical and atheistical philosophers."

P. 255. "The persons now alarmed at the restoration of "the Jesuits are (Sir John Hippisley nevertheless excepted *) "Jacobinical Philosophers, Materialists, votaries of reason "and eternal sleep."

Now, in advancing the above remarks, MR. DALLAS must not lay claim to originality: he appears to have taken his hint from the following observations in the Letters which appeared in the PILOT NEWSPAPER, and the ORTHODOX CATHOLIC MAGAZINE, viz.

"Every Prince, every observer knows that the overthrow "of the Society of Jesus was the first link in the concatenation "of causes which produced the late horrible successes of re- "bellion and infidelity."

And again: "To favor the daring projects of civil and "religious innovators, the Order was devoted to destruction, "and the extinction of it was presently followed by the uni- "versal uproar of the Gallic Revolution."

These observations, it must be admitted, have been very skilfully worked up, and amplified, by MR. DALLAS. The bullion of the newspapers and magazines has been wire-drawn through many pages of the volume which followed them; and the sum of the whole matter is (if the British public will believe it), that the French Revolution never would have happened if the Order of Jesuits had not been suppressed! It is obvious that the writers in question, by this mode of conducting the argument to their own conclusions, undertake for nothing less than to PROVE A NEGATIVE; a task which (as it has been generally held impossible) they may be safely left to accomplish if they can: at all events, no one would attempt to disturb them in the enjoyment of such a *beau idéal*.

* It does not appear why SIR JOHN HIPPISLEY is excepted from this anathema; except that, as a Member of a Parliament which is as yet a Protestant Parliament, MR. DALLAS might consider the language a little too hazardous.

Without intending at present to meddle with the question of EDUCATION, which will be considered hereafter, it may be worth while to inquire, how it appears that the Philosophers of the French Revolution were the enemies of the Jesuits.

MR. DALLAS has abundantly proved that VOLTAIRE was never the opponent of the Jesuits. It was he who wrote against PASCAL (see p. 14 of MR. DALLAS), declaring that the Society had been undeservedly defamed by the Provincial Letters. It was *he* who in writing to DAMILAVILLE (see p. 136 of MR. DALLAS), protests their innocence of the crime of DAMIENS, and declares that all posterity would acquit them of the crime of regicide; nay, MR. DALLAS himself, in p. 137 of his work, expressly asserts, that "VOLTAIRE was greatly attached to the Jesuits, and had the highest opinion of them." How then does this fact agree with MR. DALLAS's imputation? If VOLTAIRE had hated and dreaded the Jesuits, as the sworn foes of his revolutionary system, how comes he to be cited even by MR. DALLAS himself, as a strong authority in their favor? And upon what principle can MR. DALLAS connect with the fact of VOLTAIRE's defence of the Order, as recorded by himself (p. 136), the statement with which he follows it—that VOLTAIRE's revolution of established opinions and authorities was referable to the suppression of the Society?

The next statement of MR. DALLAS which is intended to prove the same position, is, that the Philosophic Infidel D'ALEMBERT was an enemy to the Jesuits.—This he would maintain, first, by an anecdote (p. 16) that D'ALEMBERT said of a Jesuit's sermon against Infidelity, "These men die hard;" a thing which if he ever did say (for no authority is given), by no means proves that the Jesuits, as a body, were at all more active in declaiming against Infidelity than those Priests, who were not Jesuits, and consequently does not, of itself, prove that D'ALEMBERT had any cause to dislike or dread the Jesuits more than other Priests.—2dly, MR. DALLAS would prove the same assertion by stating (p. 25) that D'ALEMBERT and DIDEROT were the chief Directors of the

Encyclopédie, which might very well happen without their having been more peculiarly opposed to the Jesuits than they were to the rest of the Catholic Priesthood; nor does such circumstance prove that they considered the Order of Jesuits to stand in the way of their nefarious designs in any degree more than the other regular Orders, or than the Clergy at large. But then, 3dly, the *Compte Rendu*, professed to be written by MONCLAR, was written (says MR. DALLAS) by D'ALEMBERT (p. 28). For this assertion no single proof is offered; but the attempt to invalidate the *Compte Rendu* by such a stratagem, will be noticed again hereafter. Now, so far from its being certain that D'ALEMBERT was hostile to the Jesuits, his work *De la Destruction des Jesuites* leaves his opinion on the question of the Order in considerable doubt, that book having notoriously neither pleased the Jesuits nor their opponents*: whereas, had its author considered the Jesuits as offering any peculiar obstruction to his infamous projects, and had he been the enemy to them which MR. DALLAS would represent him, he would undoubtedly have expressed himself less equivocally against the Order in question. It is somewhat remarkable also, that the very passage in PROFESSOR ROBERTSON which MR. DALLAS regards as *so highly in favor of the Jesuits* (and with the suppression of which he has charged the writer of the "Brief Account of "the Jesuits"), is taken from D'ALEMBERT's own work " *De la Destruction des Jesuites*;" ROBERTSON expressly citing that work as the authority to which he was indebted for that exculpation of the Jesuits; a circumstance which could not have happened if D'ALEMBERT had been their enemy.

The third authority to which MR. DALLAS refers in order to prove that the friends of the Revolution were the enemies of the Jesuits is that of DIDEROT, of whom he merely asserts (p. 25), that he wrote the article "JESUITES" in the French *Encyclopédie*; which no more proves that DIDEROT disliked the

* See Chalmers's *Biographical Dictionary*—Article D'ALEMBERT.

Jesuits, because they obstructed the march of the Revolution, than the circumstance of PROFESSOR ROBERTSON having been the writer of the article which (with some few alterations) was afterwards published in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA, proves that ROBERTSON was friendly to Revolutions because *he* was inimical to the Jesuits. Such is the whole amount of the evidence produced to prove that VOLTAIRE, D'ALEMBERT, and DIDEROT (the acknowledged heads of the antichristian and revolutionary confederacy) were hostile to the Jesuits; MR. DALLAS conceiving, that if he can establish the existence of such hostility, he will at the same time prove that the Jesuits were the friends of Order, Loyalty, and *l'ancien régime*; all of which those Philosophers designed to overthrow. Such a process of reasoning as this, supported by no better evidence, falls to the ground of itself.

As to the opinion of the *Abbé Proyart* to the same point (as stated in p. 135 of MR. DALLAS), there can be little doubt of his having been himself a Jesuit: he found it necessary indeed to deny this charge, as many of his Brethren had done before him, who were however not the less Jesuits on that account.

MR. DALLAS, in order to prove further that the suppression of the Jesuits was injurious to Monarchy and Order, adds the testimonies of the President D'EGUILLES (p. 133), the Infidel King FREDERIC OF PRUSSIA (p. 143), and BAUSSET (p. 145).

Now, how does the fact really appear to have stood? That VOLTAIRE and his School were in a league against the Catholic Religion, and Continental Governments, scarcely any one can doubt; and that they succeeded, in conjunction with other causes, in discrediting that religion, and subverting many of those Governments, is equally clear: thus far the opponents and defenders of the Jesuits are agreed. MR. DALLAS, however, is not content that the opponents of the Jesuits should travel so far with him, and then stop, but flatters himself he shall have their concurrence in another proposition, namely,

that the new Philosophers abhorred the Jesuits because they were the chief instruments in preventing the spread of impiety and rebellion; that they conspired to suppress the Order on this very account; and that if the Jesuits had never been suppressed, the French Revolution, with all its direful train of evils, would never have occurred. — MR. DALLAS has in the first place failed to prove that the new Philosophers had any particular quarrel with the Jesuits, or had any hand in their suppression; and much less has he proved that if such suppression had not taken place, the French Revolution would never have happened.

What, then, was the real occasion of that confederacy of wit and talent, which burst forth with such scorching and destructive effects at the period alluded to?

This question admits of an easy solution. The progress from Superstition to Infidelity, or from a corrupt religion to no religion at all, is very simple: the history of mankind, in all ages, furnishes examples to prove this point.—Under the Pagan system, which was no other than a corruption of the Patriarchal and Primitive Dispensation, the lapses from the national faith were almost of course, and the wise and learned men of Greece and Rome (as a general question) either openly denied the authority of “them that were no Gods,” and derided the claims of the Priesthood; or else acquiesced in such a system, from a notion, that even a false Religion was, as a question of State, better than none at all.—In like manner, under the corruptions of the Papacy, it was impossible that as knowledge was diffused through the world from the period of the Reformation downwards, and men were permitted to think for themselves, the errors and inconsistencies of Popery should not become apparent, precisely in that proportion in which light was thrown upon the human intellect. Inquirers of this description found that the Religion of the Romish Church would not abide a close examination, and that it would much less endure the test of a comparison with the Scriptures of Truth.—The doctrine of Papal Infallibility, for example, was too monstrous for good men to recognise with

safety to their consciences, when they observed the errors which the Popes had committed, and the vices in which they had indulged: while that of Papal Supremacy was too gross, either for wise Statesmen or true Patriots to admit with safety to their country. Thus also it was found, that the spiritual power claimed and exercised by the Romish Clergy (each of whom became the Pope of his own district), was equally at variance with the dictates of good sense and sound reasoning. They found that the doctrine of Purgatory accorded no better with any thing which the Scripture had revealed in support of it, than it did with the constant declaration of Scripture, that the present was a state of probation, and the future, of retribution. The doctrine of Papal or Priestly Absolution appeared to them only an usurpation, by man, of a power which belonged to his Creator, while that of Papal or Priestly Indulgences afforded sanction and toleration for every species of crime. They considered the terrors of Excommunication and Anathema, as the mere engines of temporal power, assumed for secular purposes alone. They regarded the doctrine of Transubstantiation as an invention, by which a mystery was introduced into the simplest Institution, for no other purpose than to enforce the necessity, and exalt the authority, of a standing Priesthood. They found that Auricular Confession, while it enabled the Ministers of Religion to penetrate into the secrets of families and individuals, tended, above every other expedient, to consolidate their power, and to multiply their resources. They considered the denial of the Bible to the common people, as an evident mark of the departure of that Church from the truths which it revealed, and the strongest proof of the weakness of a system which could resort to such a measure. They further regarded all the attempts of the Romish Church to mix human Tradition with divine Revelation, as utterly unjustifiable upon every principle; and as little could they endure to see Tradition putting its own gloss and comment upon the Scripture, and virtually invalidating the sanctions, and evading the force, of the word of God him-

self. They observed that a contempt of the Institution of the Sabbath was a characteristic of Popery, wherever that Religion prevailed; and that the violation of the Marriage Vow was almost peculiar to the same system. They observed a religion of forms, processions, ceremonies, and externals, usurping the place of that Holy Faith which invariably produces the fruits of Holiness, without which the Religion of every man is in the sight of God utterly vain. There appeared, further, in Prayers and Invocations being offered to Saints, many of whom had been canonized by the Romish Church, after lives of open and notorious sin, to be something as repugnant to reason as it was contrary to revelation: They observed further, that the cruelties and persecutions which that Church had exercised in every age, were altogether opposed to the religion of the Prince of Peace, and calculated only to alienate the friends of Religion, and multiply its enemies. When to these considerations, men who were in search after truth, added the immoral and scandalous lives of the Catholic Clergy as a Body, chiefly arising out of their self-imposed Celibacy, they were still further revolted*. In cases where inquiries of this description had their proper operation, many of the Individuals who made them, silently consulted their Bibles; looked up for the wisdom that “ de-“ scendeth from above;” and, without openly quitting a Church

* This was peculiarly the case in Spain.—“ The religion of Spain” (says Mr. Pinkerton in his Geography) “ is the Roman Catholic, which “ in this country and Portugal has been carried to a pitch of fanati-“ cism.—The Monks being extremely numerous, and human passions “ ever the same, those Ascetics atone for the want of marriage by the “ practice of Adultery, and the Husbands, from the dread of the Inqui-“ sition, are constrained to connive at this enormous abuse. The con-“ science is seared by the practice of Absolution; and the mind becomes “ reconciled to the strangest of all phenomena, theoretic piety and practical “ vice united in bonds almost indissoluble. The vice becomes flagrant beyond “ conception, as it is practised by those very men who ought to exhibit examples “ of pure morality.” Pinkerton’s Geography, vol. i. pp. 409 and 415.

which had departed from her first faith, secretly renounced her errors, became spiritually enlightened ; and receiving in sincerity the great fundamental truths, which the Romish Church holds in common with the Protestant, they rejected those doctrines of human imposition which were unnecessary to salvation, and those depraved practices which were absolutely opposed to it: with some such humble and honest worshippers, the Romish Church has been graced and blessed in every age; and such, many such, are at this moment to be found within her pale. Other inquirers who had arrived at the same conclusions, openly deserted the Church of Rome, and went over to the reformed Faith.

A third class, however, which was by far the most numerous, having talent enough to detect the absurdities of the Romish Church, and wit enough to expose them; observing the grossest errors both of doctrine and practice passing current under the name of Religion; and being too proud to inquire, whether, amidst such a mass of evil, some good might not lie concealed; themselves sensual and profligate, and determined, notwithstanding, to hold fast their vices, these men did not care to go over to a purer system, of which they knew as little, and thought as ill, as of their own; and yet they would not permit the multitude to continue in a track which could so easily be demonstrated to be a wrong one. They visited therefore the abuses of the *Catholic* Religion upon Religion itself, and judging of every other Religion by the specimen before them, they invited the world to do the same, and unfortunately succeeded too well. With men whose abilities enabled them to expose the abominations of the national faith, but whose profligacy made it necessary for them to wish there was no better, there was no other resource than in something worse, and that alternative was INFIDELITY: once embarked on an ocean like this, it was only natural that they should desire companions for such a voyage; in other words, that they should wish to render all men as wicked and wretched as themselves. In attacking the Clergy, in order to attain their object, they cer-

tainly were not likely to spare any part of that body: but to contend, as MR. DALLAS does, that they singled out THE JESUITES, as more peculiarly against their new Philosophy than others, and that, by doing so, they proved the Jesuits to be the steady friends of true Religion, regular government, and the peace of the world; these are positions which MR. DALLAS must be content to have asserted, for they are utterly incapable of proof.

If, indeed, the new Philosophers had pursued a course decidedly hostile to the Jesuits, there would have been nothing surprising in it, when it is considered that the Order of Jesuits formed the most corrupt modification of a corrupt system: and therefore, so far from that event (if it had taken place) having in any way assisted MR. DALLAS in establishing either the moral purity or political utility of the Jesuits, it could only have gone to confirm the fact already advanced; namely, that the debased condition into which the Catholic Religion had sunk, was in fact the occasion of an Infidel attack upon Religion itself, through the medium of a Church whose members, whether they might call themselves by one name or another, had, as a general question, apostatized from the truth.

In confirmation of this opinion, a thousand modern authorities might be cited; one only may suffice: it is that of PINKERTON—"It may perhaps" (says he) "be asserted, that the Roman Catholic system in the south of Europe is the only Superstition in the universe which has at any period necessitated the practice of vice; thus confirming the maxim, that the corruption of the purest and best system, is always the worst. Were an Apostle again to visit SPAIN, he would certainly begin with preaching the Christian practice, as if the very idea of Christianity had perished, and his first duty would be TO CONVERT THE ECCLESIASTICS."—Again, speaking of France, he says, "The laws and decency of marriage are frequently sacrificed, and the looseness of the French morals in regard to the female sex has become proverbial." And further, "The religion of FRANCE was the Roman Catholic,

“ till the Revolution established freedom of conscience, OR RA-
 “ THER GAVE AN UNDUE ASCENDENCY TO CONCEALED ATHE-
 “ ISM, WHICH ANY SUPERSTITION REMARKABLY ABSURD HAS A
 “ TENDENCY TO PRODUCE. But the strongest minds, as usual,
 “ remained deistical.” See Pinkerton’s Geography, vol. i.
 pp. 415, 253 and 257.

Now, without endeavouring to strike the balance of iniquity between Atheism and Deism, it is by this time pretty well agreed that a deplorable corruption existed on the Continent before the French Revolution; and that, in the righteous judgment of God, even an Infidel Philosophy was permitted to become the scourge of the perverted Faith and criminal practices which had taken the place of all true Religion and virtue.

It is a necessary consequence of the superstitious abuse of Religion, and of the excess to which such an abuse may be carried, that Religion itself falls into universal discredit; and is commonly replaced by Atheism, libertinism, and the contempt of all laws, divine and human.

If the following History shall be considered to establish the fact of the Jesuits having been from their origin the opponents of spiritual light, and the advocates of spiritual darkness, the unhallowed instruments of perpetuating the reign of bigotry, superstition, intolerance, and error; what then will become of MR. DALLAS’s attempt to erect these very men into Apostles of piety and purity, or of his theatrical assertion (p. 167), that they were “ ACTUATED BY THE SUB-
 “ LIMEST MOTIVES, SUCH AS MIGHT BE ATTRIBUTED TO AN-
 “ GELS, THE GLORY OF GOD, AND THE BENEFIT OF MAN-
 “ KIND?”

If that statement shall be completely negatived by the History which follows, what then will become of his minor proposition, that it was to their suppression, rather than to its own demoralized and vitiated condition, that Christian Europe must refer the tremendous visitation she has experienced; a visitation which, so far from having had the purifying and

salutary effects which might have been anticipated, has only seen her settle down again, into the dregs of the same system which was, before, her sorrow and her shame:—a visitation which, after all the expenditure of Protestant blood and treasure in defence of the rights and liberties of the world, has only issued in the restoration of the Pope, the revival of the Inquisition, and the re-establishment of the Order of Jesuits?

So far from MR. DALLAS having established his extraordinary theory, that the Jesuits would have prevented the revolution of opinions which preceded the revolution of Governments, it is well known that some persons, and particularly NICHOLAI of Berlin, informed the public, during the same period in which the new Philosophers were at work, that, so far from the Jesuits having ever been effectually suppressed, they were at that very time actively engaged in abetting and supporting the advocates of Infidelity; and that the members of the Society of Jesus were then to be found in every place, under various habits and characters, labouring with indefatigable zeal for the re-establishment of their own government upon the ruin of others. Whether this opinion be true or false, will be best ascertained by a reference to the evidence which that writer and others collected and published in Germany in support of it: but at all events it may serve to shew, that before the Public consents to be concluded by the positive assertions of MR. DALLAS on this subject, the interests of truth require that an opinion so entirely at variance with his own, should be fairly examined; an opinion which undoubtedly corresponds better with the recorded History of Jesuitism than that which is advanced by MR. DALLAS, and which (as we have seen) he has supported by no better authority.

It may be very fairly questioned, whether the Jesuits, so far from being pure of all design to promote Scepticism and Infidelity on the Continent, did not actually encourage and forward the propagation of those principles from the period of their public suppression, as an Order, down to the time immediately antecedent to the French Revolution; and this by

means of the Masonic Lodges which abounded both in France and Germany, and which are now well known to have been abused to the vilest purposes. There seems at least to be some evidence in support of such an opinion from the following authority. PROFESSOR ROBISON, in the Introduction to his *Proofs of a Conspiracy against the Religions and Governments of Europe*, says, "German Freemasonry was much connected with "many occurrences and schisms in the Christian Church: I "found that THE JESUITS HAD SEVERAL TIMES INTERFERED "IN IT; AND THAT MOST OF THE EXCEPTIONABLE INNOVA- "TIONS AND DISSENSIONS HAD ARISEN ABOUT THE TIME "THAT THE ORDER OF JESUITS WAS SUPPRESSED; SO THAT "IT SHOULD SEEM THAT THESE INTRIGUING BRETHREN HAD "ATTEMPTED TO MAINTAIN THEIR INFLUENCE BY MEANS OF "FREEMASONRY."

Afterwards, speaking of Freemasonry in England in the time of the Civil war, he says, "I have met with many particular "facts, which convince me that at this time THE JESUITS IN- "TERFERED CONSIDERABLY, insinuating themselves into the "Lodges, and contributing to increase that religious mysticism "that is observable in all the Ceremonies of the Order. This "Society is well known to have put on every shape, and to have "made use of every method that could promote the power "and influence of the Order: and we know that at this time "they were by no means without hopes of re-establishing the "dominion of the Church of Rome in England." See p. 21 of Professor Robison's work. Again, adverting to the period which followed the English Revolution of 1688, he says, "King James *, with many of his most zealous adherents,

* That the attachment of King James II. to Popery (by which he lost his Crown) was chiefly referable to the intrigues of the Jesuits, will appear from the well-known letter of a Jesuit of Liege to a Jesuit of Fribourg, dated 2d February, 1684, given at length by RAPIN. This Letter was circulated publicly through Switzerland, and was copied by BURNET, at Zurich. It is as follows:

"It is wonderful to see King James's great affection to our Society:

“ took refuge in France: they took Freemasonry with them to
“ the Continent, where it was immediately received by the
“ French, and was cultivated with great zeal, in a manner

“ He wished prosperity to all this College, by the Reverend Father,
“ the Provincial, and earnestly recommended himself to our prayers.
“ Upon Father John Keynes’s return to England, he gave him a most
“ gracious reception (while Earls and Dukes were commanded for some
“ hours to wait for admittance); with whom, in the Queen’s presence,
“ he discoursed with all familiarity. He asked him, how many Can-
“ didates for Orders he had, and how many Students? And upon the
“ Provincial’s answer to his Majesty, who was urgent with him, that
“ of the former and the latter he had above fifty; he replied, there
“ would be occasion for double or treble that number, to effect what
“ he designed for that Society’s performance; and ordered that they
“ should be all exercised in the art of preaching; for now, says he,
“ England has need of such.

“ I do not doubt but you have heard, that the King, writing to
“ Father de La Chaise, the French King’s Confessor, concerning the
“ affairs of the House among the Walloons, declared, that whatever
“ was done to the English Fathers of that House, he would look upon
“ as done to himself. Father Clare, Rector of the same House, being
“ arrived at London to treat of that matter, got an easy access to the
“ King, and as easily gained his point. The King himself forbad him
“ to kneel and kiss his hand, according to custom, saying, ‘ Reverend
“ Father, you have indeed once kissed my hand; but if I had known
“ then, as I do now, that you were a Priest, I would rather myself,
“ Father, have kneeled down, and kissed your hand.’ After he had
“ finished his business, in a familiar conversation, his Majesty told this
“ Father, that he would either convert England, or die a Martyr; and
“ that he had rather die the next day and convert it, than reign twenty
“ years piously and happily, and not effect it. Finally, he called him-
“ self a Son of the Society, of whose good success, he said, he was as
“ glad as of his own. And it can scarcely be expressed how much
“ gratitude he shewed, when it was told him, that he was made par-
“ taker, by the most Reverend our Provincial, of all the merits of the
“ Society; out of which he is to nominate one for his Confessor; but
“ hitherto it is not known who it will be; some report that it will be
“ the Reverend Father the Provincial, but still there is no certainty of
“ that. Many are of opinion, that Father Edward R. Petre, who is
“ chiefly in favour with the King, will obtain an Archbishoprick, but
“ more believe it will be a Cardinal’s cap. To him has been granted

“ suited to the taste of that polished people. The Lodges in
“ France naturally became the rendezvous of the adherents to
“ the exiled King, and the means of carrying on a corre-

“ within this month or two, all that part of the Palace, in which the
“ King used to reside when he was Duke of York, where there is not
“ a day, but you may see I know not how many courtiers waiting to
“ speak to his *Eminence*, for so they say he is called. For the King ad-
“ vises with him, and with many Catholic Lords who have the chief
“ places in the kingdom, to find a method to propagate the faith with-
“ out violence. Not long since some of these Lords objected to the
“ King, that they thought he made too much haste to establish the
“ Faith. To whom he answered, ‘I am growing old, and must take
“ large steps; else, if I should happen to die, I might perhaps leave you
“ in a worse condition than I found you.’ When they asked him,
“ Why then he was so little concerned about the conversion of his
“ Daughters, who were the Heirs of the kingdom? he answered,
“ ‘God will take care of that; leave the conversion of my Daughters to
“ me; do you, by your example, convert your Tenants and others to
“ the Faith.’

“ He has Catholic Lord-Lieutenants in most counties; and we shall
“ have shortly Catholic Justices of the Peace in almost all places.
“ We hope also that our affairs will have good success at Oxford. In
“ the public Chapel of the Vice-Chancellor, who is a Roman Catholic,
“ there is always one of our Divines, who has converted some of the
“ Students to the Faith. The Bishop of Oxford himself seems to be a
“ great Favourer of the Catholic Faith: he proposed to the Council,
“ whether it did not seem to be expedient, that at least one College
“ should be granted to the Catholics at Oxford, that they might not be
“ forced to study beyond sea at such great expenses; but it is not
“ known what answer he had. The same Bishop having invited two of
“ our brethren, together with some of the Nobility, drank the King’s
“ health to a certain Heretic Lord who was in company, wishing his
“ Majesty good success in all his undertakings; adding also, that the
“ religion of the Protestants in England, did not seem to him in a bet-
“ ter condition, than Buda was before it was taken; and that they
“ were next to Atheists that defended that Faith. Many embrace the
“ true religion, and four of the most considerable Earls have lately
“ made public profession of it. Father Alexander Keynes, the Provin-
“ cial’s Nephew, to whom is committed the care of the Chapel belong-
“ ing to the Elector Palatine’s Envoy, is continually taken up in solv-
“ ing and answering the questions of Heretics, who doubt of their

“ spondence with their friends in England. AT THIS TIME
“ ALSO, THE JESUITS TOOK A MORE ACTIVE HAND IN FREE-
“ MASONRY THAN EVER. They insinuated themselves into
“ the English Lodges, where they were caressed by the

“ Faith, of whom you may see two or three together walking by the
“ Chapel-door, continually disputing about some point of religion.
“ As to Prince George, it is yet uncertain what religion he professes.
“ We gradually begin to get footing in England; we teach human
“ learning at Lincoln, Norwich, and York; and at Worcester we have
“ a public Chapel, protected by a Guard of the King’s soldiers; and
“ we are to buy some horses at Wigan in Lancashire. The Catholic
“ interest grows very strong; and at some Churches, granted to the
“ Catholics, upon Holydays there are often counted fifteen hundred
“ present at the sermon. At London also, our business is carried on
“ with the same good success: sermons are preached upon every Holy-
“ day, and there are so many that frequent the Chapels, that they are
“ not big enough to hold them. Two of our Society, Dormer and
“ Bertue, preach continually before the King and the Queen; Father
“ Richard Neville, before the Queen Dowager, Father Alexander
“ Keynes in the Chapel aforesaid; others in other chapels. There are
“ many houses bought in the Savoy, near Somerset House, which is the
“ Queen Dowager’s Palace, towards erecting the first College in Lon-
“ don, for about eighteen thousand florins; and they are hard at work
“ to bring them to the form of a College, that a School may be open-
“ ed before Easter.

“ A Catholic Lord-Lieutenant is shortly to go over to Ireland, be-
“ cause the King cannot be satisfied with any other, to establish the
“ Catholic interest in that kingdom. The Parliament will certainly sit
“ in this month of February, of whom his Majesty is resolved to ask
“ three things: first, that by a general Act all the Catholic Peers may
“ be admitted to sit in the Upper House: secondly, that the Test may
“ be abolished: and thirdly, which is the chief point, that all the Penal
“ Laws against Catholics should be abrogated. And that he may the
“ better obtain these things, he designs to let them know, that he is re-
“ solved to turn out all those who will not heartily act for the obtain-
“ ing of them; and likewise dissolve the Parliament. At which Reso-
“ lution some Heretics being terrified, came to a certain Earl to advise
“ him what might be done: to whom he answered, ‘The King’s mind is
“ sufficiently known: what he has once said he will certainly perform;
“ if you love yourselves, submit to the King’s pleasure.’” See Tindal’s
Rapin, vol. xv. b. xxiv. p. 85, Edit. 1731.

“ Catholics, who panted after the re-establishment of their faith, “ and tolerated by the Protestant Royalists, who thought no “ concession too great a compensation for their services. At this “ time changes were made in some of the masonic symbols, “ which bear evident marks of Jesuitical interference” (p. 27): after describing them, he adds, “ All these were *con-
trivances of the Church of Rome* for securing and extend- “ ing her influence on the Laymen of rank and fortune, “ whom she retained in her service by these playthings:” and again, “ In all this mummery we see MUCH OF THE HAND “ OF THE JESUITS; and it would seem that it was encouraged “ by the Church.” (p. 30.) Again: “ There can be no doubt, “ that, in those hidden assemblies, a free communication of “ sentiment was highly relished, and much indulged. It was “ soon suspected that such use was made of the covert of a “ Mason Lodge; and the Church dreaded the consequences, “ and endeavoured to suppress the Lodges; but in vain: and “ when it was found that even Auricular Confession and “ the spiritual threatenings of the Church could not make “ the Brethren break their oath of secrecy, a full confidence “ in their security made these free-thinking Brethren bring “ forward with all the eagerness of a missionary, such senti- “ ments as they were afraid to hazard in ordinary society. “ This was long suspected; but the rigours of the Church only “ served to knit the Brethren more firmly together, and pro- “ voked them to a more eager exercise of their bold criticisms. “ THE LODGES BECAME SCHOOLS OF SCEPTICISM AND INFIDE- “ LITY, and the spirit of proselytism grew every day stronger. “ CARDINAL DUBOIS had before this time laboured with all “ his might to corrupt the minds of the courtiers, by patron- “ izing directly and indirectly all sceptics who were other- “ wise men of talents *. He gave the young courtiers to un-

* “ This Cardinal had recommended a man of his own stamp to “ LOUIS XIV. to fill an important office: the Monarch was astonished; “ and told the Cardinal that that would never do; for the man was ♦

“derstand, that if he should obtain the reins of government, “they should be entirely freed from the bigotry of LOUIS XIV. and the oppression of the Church, and should have “the free indulgence of their inclinations: his own plans were “disappointed by his death; but the Regent ORLEANS was “equally indulgent, and in a few years there was hardly a “man in France who pretended to knowledge and reflection, “who did not laugh at all religion: amidst the almost infinite “number of publications from the French presses there is “hardly a dozen to be found where the author attempts to “vindicate religion from the charges of universal superstition “and falsehood: AND IT MUST BE ACKNOWLEDGED THAT “LITTLE ELSE WAS TO BE SEEN IN THE ESTABLISHED RELIGION OF THE KINGDOM. The people found nothing in “Christianity but a never-ceasing round of insignificant and “troublesome ceremonies, which consumed their time, and “furnished a fund for supporting a set of lordly and oppressive dignitaries, who declared in the plainest manner their “own disbelief of their religion, by their total disregard of “common decency, by their continual residence at Court, and “by absolute neglect and even the most haughty and oppressive treatment of the only part of their Order that took any “concern about the religious sentiments of the nation, namely, “the *Curés* or Parish Priests: the Monks appeared only as “lazy drones; but the parish priests instructed the people, “visited the sick, reconciled the offender and the offended, “and were the great mediators between the Landlords and “their Vassals, an office which endeared them more to the “people than all the other circumstances of their profession; “and it is remarkable that in all the licentious writings and “bitter satirical tales of the Philosophic freethinkers, such as “VOLTAIRE, who never fails to have a taunting hit at the “Clergy, the *Curé* is generally an amiable personage, a cha-

“JANSENIST. *Eh! que non, Sire*, said the Cardinal; *il n'est qu'Atbée*: “this was satisfactory, and the man got the Priory.” Robison’s Proofs, &c. p. 88.

“ ritable man, a friend to the poor and unfortunate, a peace-
“ maker, and a man of piety and worth. Yet these were
“ men kept in a state of the most slavish and cruel subjection
“ by the higher orders of the Clergy, and all hopes of ad-
“ vancement cut off: rarely, hardly ever, does it happen that
“ a *Curé* becomes a Bishop: the *Abbé* steps into every line
“ of preferment. When such procedure is observed by a
“ whole nation, what opinion can be formed, but that the
“ whole is a vile cheat? This, however, was the case in
“ France, and THEREFORE INFIDELITY WAS ALMOST UNIVER-
“ SAL: nor was this freedom or licentiousness confined to reli-
“ gious opinions; it was, perhaps, more naturally directed to
“ the restraints arising from civil subordination”—and he then
proceeds to shew its results in the levelling doctrines of
equality, &c.—See Robison’s Proofs, pp. 32, 33, 34.

Again: “ Religion in France appeared in its worst form,
“ and seemed calculated solely for procuring establishments
“ for the younger sons of the insolent and useless *Noblesse*.
“ The morals of the higher order of the Clergy and of the
“ Laity were equally corrupted.”—(Robison’s Proofs, p. 60.)

Now, whether the above Extracts go the length of actually implicating the Jesuits in that great work of destruction which, by eradicating the best principles of the human heart, first alienated man from his Creator, and then from his Brother, it will be for the Public to decide: but at all events, enough, it is presumed, has been advanced to demonstrate upon what a sandy foundation MR. DALLAS has built the main argument of his work; namely, that the Jesuits were the great opponents of Scepticism and Infidelity, as also that their suppression was the death-blow of Religion and Government, and actually brought about the French Revolution.

To return to MR. DALLAS’s work—He occupies the whole of p. 17 in expressing his indignation, because, in the *Brief Account*, the word “ professed ” (quoted from the *Encyclopædia*) is printed in *Italics*. It is not always easy for writers to say, whether they or their Printers have most to answer for

in the use and abuse of Patagonian Capitals and crippled Italies: but charity might have led MR. DALLAS to believe that no perversion of History was intended by the selection of a crooked letter in preference to a straight one; or otherwise he should not himself (as he has done in p. 8) have put several words in that same deformed character, although ROBERTSON, from whom they are quoted by MR. DALLAS, gave those words all the advantage that he considered them entitled to, when he placed them upright on their legs.

In p. 18 MR. DALLAS complains of the "disingenuousness" (as he terms it) "of charging the Jesuits *exclusively* with rendering Christianity utterly odious in Japan," where, as he contends, *the Franciscan Friars* were guilty too.

The answer to this is very simple: It has been no where an object to charge the Jesuits *exclusively* with the crimes in which they were engaged; but rather to shew that they frequently acted in concert with the Catholic Clergy, and even Laity, when it suited their purpose: indeed, MR. DALLAS is so sensible of this, that, in p. 11 of his Preface, he states the ostensible object of the *Brief Account* to be, to "render "the Order odious, but the real one to be an attempt to attach odium upon *Catholics in general* in the present crisis "of the Catholic question." The fact is, that in stating the Jesuits to have rendered Christianity odious in Japan, the *Brief Account* does not happen to exhibit the part taken in that affair by those who were *not* Jesuits, as is done in other instances; and this accidental omission is therefore converted by MR. DALLAS into a charge of an *intentional* design to fix upon the Jesuits *exclusively* the crimes in question. When MR. DALLAS, however, finds the other Orders of the Catholic Religion implicated, together with the Jesuits, as in the relation of the troubles in France, in the time of the League, or the Gunpowder Plot in England; he then shifts his position, and finds cause for censure because other Catholics are reflected on *as well as the Jesuits*. In one instance he thinks the Catholics ought to come in for their share of condemnation;

in another he thinks they ought to have been spared: in order, however, to the complete exculpation of the Jesuits in Japan, MR. DALLAS should have shewn that they did not render Christianity odious there; for, until he can do that, the statement that they did, is not controverted by his proving that other Catholics did so too. It is under a conviction that, in order to clear the Jesuits at all, he must clear them altogether, that he therefore, in p. 19, would have us doubt whether either the Jesuits or the Priests were to blame; and thus, after having admitted that the Jesuits really acted with the other Priests, he quotes MONTESQUIEU to shew that “the Magistrates of Japan punished the people for not renouncing the Christian Religion:” undoubtedly they did; but does this refute what has been first asserted, namely, that the Jesuits had rendered Christianity odious there? MONTESQUIEU’s remark applies to the period of time when the Jesuits had rendered Christianity so odious, that the government of that country determined none of its subjects should belong to such a profession. When MONTESQUIEU, therefore, states that the Magistrates punished Christians in Japan; this does not prove that the Jesuits were innocent of the scandal thus brought upon Christianity, or that they had not been instrumental in bringing it into disrepute and contempt*. The proof that they actually did so, must be referred to the following History.

MR. DALLAS then (p. 20) asserts, that, as “to the enormities in China, the Jesuits were not more responsible for these;” and in order to prove this, he quotes what he calls “a geographical Account of China” (without informing us to what account he alludes), the Extract from which goes to shew, that two Jesuits having begun the mission in China, they had many followers, “until the Dominicans and Franciscans took the field, and THEN contentions broke out.”

* See MONTESQUIEU’s *Esprit des Loix*, Book xxv. Chap. 14; (quoted by mistake in MR. DALLAS as Book v. Chap. 14).

Now, supposing this geographical account to be true in itself, and correctly quoted, it is clear that it would only prove that two other Catholic Orders were involved in contentions of some sort or other *with the Order of Jesuits* in China; but it was not with contentions of any kind that the Jesuits had been accused, when they were charged with “*enormities* in China.” The *enormities* alluded to were their open and scandalous alliance of Idolatry with Christianity, and their inculcation, in that Empire, of an impure and debased form of worship, in which the rites and sacrifices of Heathens were mixed with the purer religion of Christ; and all this, in direct contravention of their professed object, which was to convert Pagan Idolaters, and to evangelize the world by means of those Missions of which MR. DALLAS speaks so highly—Let us hear what PALAFOX the Bishop of ANGELOPOLIS says of this matter in his Letter to POPE INNOCENT X. dated 8th January, 1649:

“ The whole Church (says he) publicly laments that it has “ been rather seduced than instructed in China by what the “ Jesuits have taught respecting the faith: they have kept “ the Cross of the Saviour out of sight, and authorized cus-“ toms absolutely pagan; instead of Christianizing Idolaters, “ they have heathenized Christians; they have united God “ and Belial at the same Table, in the same Temple, at the “ same Altar, and in the same Sacrifices; in fact, Idols are “ worshipped in that nation under the mask of Christianity, “ or rather the purity of our holy faith is polluted under the “ mask of Idolatry. They have not only permitted the new “ Converts to frequent the Temples where Idols are adored, “ but to take part in the abominable Sacrifices which are offer-“ ed to them; nay, they themselves offer sacrifices to the Idols, “ prostrate themselves before them, present incense to them, “ and erect the Cross in the same Temple with Dagon; the “ Idolatry of such rites being evaded by a pretext of the Je-“ suits, directing the inward attention of the worshipper to a “ Cross which is carried in secret at the same time that exte-“ rior worship is offered to the Idol.”—“ No other Ecclesiastical

“ Order ever departed so widely from the true principles of
 “ the Christian religion. It has been seen, that, instead of
 “ teaching the new Converts as they ought, the new Converts
 “ have inveigled their Teachers into Idolatry, and have in-
 “ duced them to embrace a worship and customs which are
 “ detestable; so that the fish has not been taken by the
 “ angler, but the angler has been caught by the fish*.—I
 “ have a whole volume of apologies of the Jesuits, in which
 “ they not only ingenuously admit their most pernicious mode
 “ of instructing the Chinese Converts, but *Didaque de Mo-*
 “ *ralez*, the Rector of their College of St. Joseph in Manilla,
 “ which is the metropolitan City of the Philippines, obsti-
 “ nately defends (in a work of three hundred pages) all those
 “ things which your Holiness has very justly condemned by
 “ seventeen Decrees of the Congregation *de propagandâ fide*,
 “ and endeavours by all the subtilty in his power to overturn
 “ the reasoning contained in those decrees.”

That it may not be imagined that this Bishop had not the best means of information on the subject, it is proper to add his own declaration in support of his statement—

“ As I am nearer to this people (the Chinese) than any
 “ other Prelate; as I have not only received Letters from
 “ their Instructors, but am acquainted with all the facts of the
 “ case, and am in possession of all the documents that have
 “ appeared upon it: and as, in the character of a Bishop,
 “ God has called me to the government of his Church, I
 “ should have cause to tremble at the awful day of Judgment,

* “ A man (says BISHOP HORNE) should be very well established
 “ in faith and virtue, who attempts to reclaim a profligate; otherwise
 “ he may become a convert, instead of making one. *Chapelle* was met
 “ one day in the street by his friend *Boileau*, who took the opportunity
 “ of mentioning to him his habit of drinking, and its consequences:
 “ unfortunately, they were just by a Tavern; *Chapelle* only desired
 “ they might step in there, and promised he would listen patiently and
 “ attentively; *Boileau* consented, and the event was, that about one in
 “ the morning, they were carried home dead drunk in separate
 “ coaches.”—Bishop Horne’s *Thoughts and Essays*.

“if, having his spiritual Sheep committed to my charge, I had not represented to your Holiness how many scandals are occasioned by this doctrine of the Jesuits in those places where the true faith alone should be propagated.”

In p. 21 MR. DALLAS repeats his charge, that the object of the remarks on the Jesuits is “to excite a ferment against the Catholic claims.”

There is something in the mode of putting this observation which requires attention. The charge of a desire *to excite a ferment* against the claims of the Catholics is not justified by any thing which has been offered. An attempt has certainly been made to shew that such claims are, under any circumstances, fraught with danger to a Protestant State—and further, that with Jesuits both in England and Ireland to enforce those claims, and (in the event of their being conceded) to take advantage of that concession, in conjunction with other Catholics, such danger becomes formidable in no common degree.

It will not be denied, that a great measure of state policy, new in its nature, vast in its magnitude, and hazardous in its consequences, has been proposed by the Catholics and their advocates. It is the inalienable privilege of every Englishman to examine this question, involving, as it appears to do, his dearest interests, his civil and religious rights and liberties, and all that he has been accustomed to consider most sacred in this world. It is equally his privilege to convey his opinion to his Countrymen, with his reasons for the conclusion to which he may have come. If any other man should take a different view of the subject, he is also at liberty to express his opinion; but by what right does he venture to impute to his neighbour any desire to “excite a ferment” by his preceding statement? If the imputation of such unworthy motives were in any case decent or admissible, with how much greater appearance of justice might they be referred to those who, in advocating the Catholic claims, desire (to say no more) that a sensible and radical alteration should be made in the Constitution

of this country at this moment? Let such an imputation therefore be taken back, and let no man, while our Press is free, be deterred from avowing, on a question of this description, the plain and honest feelings of his heart.

MR. DALLAS (in p. 24) compliments PROFESSOR ROBERTSON for being an elegant and cautious Historian, for which, however, the author of the Letters in THE PILOT NEWSPAPER will not thank him; since the latter has classed that Historian among "the modern corrupters of History," and "the throng of servile Imitators whose historical romances have so much contributed to render religion odious, and to plunge mankind into scepticism and Infidelity."

MR. DALLAS has not in this instance strictly adhered to his text: but he makes ample amends for his deviation, by endeavouring, as in every other instance, to invalidate ROBERTSON's whole statement, and to discredit every authority he has cited; thus evincing himself worthy of treading in the steps which the writer of the Letters in the Pilot newspaper had trodden before him.

MR. DALLAS attempts in the first place (pages 24-28-29) to overthrow the authority of the COMPTES RENDUS, or the Statements made to the Parliaments of Brittany and Provence by CHALOTAIS and MONCLAR, both which are quoted, and commented on, by ROBERTSON.

MR. DALLAS calls them "fabrications," and asserts that the memorial of the former was written by D'ALEMBERT, and not by CHALOTAIS; after which he strives to prove from the modern testimony of M. LALLY TOLENDAL, that CHALOTAIS was unworthy of credit, which is a work of supererogation, if CHALOTAIS was not its author. No tittle of evidence, however, beyond the assertion of Mr. DALLAS himself, is adduced to shew, that this statement was *not* written by CHALOTAIS, or that it *was* written by D'ALEMBERT.—MR. DALLAS then asserts, that the *Compte Rendu* of MONCLAR "was sent to "him from Paris with a promise of being the next Chancellor "of France if he would adopt it, and engage his Parliament

“in the cause;” that “the President of that Parliament “refusing to concur in the measure, was, through MONCLAR’s “means, banished, and his adherents with him, by a *Lettre de cachet* ;” that “MONCLAR died repentant, and retracted all “that he had said, in presence of the Bishop of Apt, who “made a minute of the fact.”

This is so much pure gratuitous assertion, for which no particle of evidence is attempted to be produced by MR. DALLAS. On the contrary, all evidence is completely against it. MR. DALLAS’s story of the recantation of MONCLAR at the time of his death was stated in a work published by a Jesuit about two years since in Paris, entitled *Dissertation Historique et Politique sur la Nécessité de retablir en France l’Instruction publique et l’Education de la Jeunesse*; a work which, under that specious title, is neither more nor less than an earnest recommendation to recal the Jesuits, and to which work MR. DALLAS appears to have been indebted on more than one occasion.

So far from MONCLAR having retracted a single fact which he had advanced against the Jesuits, or recanted any opinion he had formed, it is altogether untrue that he did so; either by his will, or any other document, deposited with the Bishop of Apt, or any other person. MONCLAR died on the 12th February, 1773: the *Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques* of the 9th May, 1773 (three months after his death), will prove that a *procès verbal* signed by eleven witnesses was drawn up at the desire of his family, which testifies that no retraction whatever was made by him relative to the Jesuits: this *procès verbal* was deposited with a notary, and *Madame de Monclar* presented a copy of it to LOUIS XV. for the purpose of proving the falsity of the charge which had been preferred by the Jesuits against the memory of her husband, and which is thus repeated by MR. DALLAS. In the same Paper of the 9th May, 1773, will be found a report of the whole conduct of the Bishop of Apt on that occasion.—See *Les Jesuites tels qu’ils ont été, &c.* note 28, p. 305.

Now, against this attempted falsification by MR. DALLAS of original documents, we have (in addition to the above proof of MONCLAR's having died in the same opinions)—first, the universal understanding and belief of France (with the exception of certain Jesuits, who will deny this, or any other hostile evidence), that these *Comptes Rendus* were the genuine productions of the writers from whom they purport to come: 2dly, the intrinsic evidence of these documents to their originality and truth: 3dly, the collateral evidence furnished by the documents themselves, from the works of the Jesuits, in support of the facts they detail; and lastly, the express assurance of PROFESSOR ROBERTSON, that the two Individuals whose characters are thus aspersed, and whose writings are thus disputed by MR. DALLAS, were “RESPECTABLE MAGISTRATES AND ELEGANT WRITERS:” but further we have this striking observation of PROFESSOR ROBERTSON on the *Comptes Rendus* (which it did not answer MR. DALLAS's purpose to produce); “I rest not my ‘narrative’ (says he) ‘upon their authority, but upon innumerable passages which they have extracted from the ‘Constitutions of the Order deposited in their hands.’”

If, therefore, MR. DALLAS had succeeded in proving the *Comptes Rendus* to be written by other persons than they purport to be (which, however, he has entirely failed to do), he must, in addition, annihilate the Constitutions of the Jesuits, before he can extinguish the important light which the *Comptes Rendus* afford.

In p. 25, MR. DALLAS says, “the Parliament hated the ‘Jesuits as friends of the Pope; and the University, as rival ‘teachers; and those two bodies combined to exterminate ‘them.”

It is thus that he proposes to extinguish the blaze of evidence furnished by the continued opposition of the several Universities and Parliaments of France, during a period of two hundred years!!!

Lest MR. DALLAS's mode of stating the question should induce a belief that it was merely the Parliament and Univer-

sity of PARIS which declared against the Jesuits, it may be right to observe that they were opposed at different periods, and with various success (to say nothing of the Parliament of England), by the Parliaments of Languedoc, Guienne, Burgundy, Normandy, Provence, Brittany, and of the Low Countries; and by the Universities of Thoulouse, Montpellier, Orleans, Cahors, Angers, Aix, Poictiers, Caen, Valence, Bourges, Bourdeaux, Rheims, Douay, Louvain, and Avignon; and by those of Padua in Italy, Coimbra in Portugal, Prague in Bohemia, Dillingen in Suabia, Vienna in Germany, and Cracow in Poland.

The real nature and causes of such a formidable and continued opposition on the part of those Bodies will appear in so detailed a form in the following History, that it is unnecessary to notice them here; but it may be well to observe, that MR. DALLAS's assertion (p. 26), that the University and Parliament of Paris took a principal share in THE LEAGUE, will not prove that THE JESUITS were innocent of contributing to the horrors of that unhappy period. There can be little doubt that those of the Catholic Clergy of Paris who were not Jesuits, abhorred and opposed HENRY IV. before he became a Catholic, quite as much as the Jesuits did. So long as the thunders and anathemas of POPE GREGORY XIII. were out against that Monarch, it was, in the estimation of all good Catholics, a point of duty and conscience to obey the injunctions of the Head of their Church, and to oppose, to the utmost of their power, an excommunicated Heretic. But what does MR. DALLAS gain by establishing this fact? That therefore the Jesuits were guiltless of the miseries of that distressing period? By no means—They were doubtless united in one cause; equally resisted their lawful Sovereign; and alike resorted to arms for the purpose of preventing his occupation of a throne which the Pope had declared him unworthy to fill; since the Pope, in the opinion of the whole Catholic Church, whether Jesuits or not, could not be mistaken.

There is a singular hardihood in MR. DALLAS's assertion

(p. 26), that “ the Parliaments and the Doctors, in fomenting “ the League, were seconded by all the Religious orders, THE “ JESUITS EXCEPTED ;” and further (in p. 27), that “ NOT A “ JESUIT WAS EVER PROVED TO HAVE ENTERED INTO THE “ LEAGUE, AND THAT NO WRITER ACCUSES THEM OF IT, “ THE ADVOCATES ARNAULD, PASQUIER, AND DOLLÉ ONLY “ EXCEPTED.”—The following History will prove how completely unfounded this assertion is—At present, it can only be briefly stated, that (independently of the printed proofs supplied by PASQUIER in his “ *Catéchisme des Jesuites*,” and the solemn and official acts of the University, to neither of which authorities MR. DALLAS has any right to object), MEZERAI, in his *Abrégé Chronologique*, proves that the Jesuits had a principal share in various Leagues throughout France, the grand centre of which was the League at Paris ; and, that the members were bound by oath ; that MATTHIEU the Jesuit was expressly named “ *the Courier of the League*,” on account of his frequent journeys between Rome and Paris; and MEZERAI further shews, that it was the intrigues of the Jesuits which led to the treaty between the King of Spain and the Dukes of Guise, dated 31st December, 1584, which provided, that, *in the event of the death of Henry III.* the Cardinal de Bourbon (a creature of the Jesuits) should be proclaimed King.

L'Histoire des derniers Troubles de France shews, that two Jesuits endeavoured to obtain the King's sanction to the League—that POPE SIXTUS V. in 1589, sent CARDINAL CAJETAN into France, as his Legate, assigning him the two Jesuits BELLARMINE and TYRIUS for advisers, with Instructions to use all the efforts in their power to get a King elected who should be of the Catholic Religion—that the Jesuits in Paris, who were at the head of that and the other Leagues, in order to amuse the people during the severe siege of the capital, and to divert them from a sense of the misery to which they were reduced, prescribed public processions, double fasts, and religious vows ; and, together with other monks, kept

the watch in turn—that at the head of the Council of Sixteen, the Jesuits gave an impulse to sedition, which was felt both in the capital and throughout the Kingdom; that they preached revolt in their Sermons, circulated it by their writings, and inculcated it in their congregations.

L'Histoire de la Ville de Thoulouse, by RAYNAL, shews that AUGIER the Jesuit administered the oath to the Leaguers of Thoulouse, and that its leaders pledged themselves never to acknowledge Henry IV. as their King.

DE THOU states, that on MATTHIEU's death, which happened in 1588, the General of the Jesuits appointed ODON PIGENAT his successor, whom he calls *a violent and fanatical Leaguer of the Jesuits*. The work, entitled, “*Les Jesuites “criminels de Léze Majesté*,” and CALLIER's “*History of “Marshal de Matignon*” (who was sent to quell the League, by Henry IV.), both prove the League of Bourdeaux to have been instigated by the Jesuits.

The testimony of DU BOULAY and of SULLY might be cited to the same purpose, as well as that of other Historians equally unexceptionable, all tending to establish the fact that the Jesuits were particularly active and formidable during the period of the League; a confederacy which had for its general object to extend the Catholic, and to depress the Protestant Religion throughout France; and for its particular object, to keep the Throne Catholic, and prevent the accession of Henry the IVth.

Before, therefore, MR. DALLAS had ventured upon an assertion for which he can derive no support from History, he should have considered the importance of Truth to the Public at large, and consequently to all those who undertake to inform the Public.

In p. 27, MR. DALLAS endeavours to invalidate the testimony of SULLY against the Jesuits (which is of the utmost importance), by calling him “*THE LEADER OF THE HUGO-“NOTS.*” This accurate and luminous Historian is as much above such imputations as PASCAL; but they serve to shew

with how little ceremony MR. DALLAS treats either Catholics or Protestants who have declared against the Jesuits:

“Tros Tyrius-ve mihi nullo discriminе habetur.”

PASCAL is too satirical for MR. DALLAS; and SULLY, that eminent Politician and faithful Minister, is a Hugonot, nay, a “Leader of the Hugonots,” a term of reproach for Protestants which has been hitherto employed only by Catholics!—It was not, however, to be expected that any Defender of the Jesuits would have pardoned the complete exposition of their wickedness both of doctrine and practice, which are to be found in SULLY.

There occurs, in the same page, a peculiar example of incorrect and garbled quotation, by which SULLY is made to act from motives which he himself disavows.

MR. DALLAS says, that “SULLY stopped the proceedings against the Jesuits by interposing the authority of the absent King, which (said he) is not to be compromised *pour une pique de Prêtres et de Théologiens.*” Now, while it is true that SULLY acted thus, his motives for doing so, as stated by himself, are industriously suppressed by MR. DALLAS; without which his readers must suppose that SULLY stopped the proceedings, because he sided with the Jesuits, and opposed their enemies. The *whole* truth is thus told by SULLY; from which it appears that it was a mere measure of temporary policy, by which he did not intend to commit the King or himself to any decided measure, but to which he was compelled by the peculiar circumstances of the moment: “The Jesuits” (says he) “had used great exertions on this occasion, and the party was already so strongly united, that, without reckoning the Pope, Spain, and their partisans in the League (who were not a few), they had influenced one half of the Parliament, who intrigued openly in their favor. The cause was in the hands of the most able advocates at the Bar, and the public mind was wholly divided in Paris between two such powerful factions. I considered what the

“ Cardinal de Bourbon had convinced me of, that there was
“ *no extremity to which the Jesuits would not have recourse*,
“ if they were driven out of the Kingdom, either from re-
“ venge, or from the hope of getting their banishment re-
“ voked; that they were able by their intrigues to stir up a
“ portion of Europe; that they well knew how to get the
“ persecution against them to be regarded as an injury done
“ to religion itself, and to throw on the King the odium of
“ being still attached in heart to the religion he had just
“ quitted (the Protestant); which at that moment might have
“ produced the worst effect: the King being also engaged in
“ one of those undertakings, the issue of which is always so
“ doubtful, and sometimes so critical; and finally, the most
“ powerful Catholics of the Kingdom fearing, or affecting to
“ fear, on their own behalf, that the Catholic Religion was
“ not sufficiently protected in France: for these reasons, I
“ thought that it was *more prudent not to commit the autho-*
“ *rity of the absent King on account of a dispute between*
“ *Priests and Theologians*, and I had no doubt that his Ma-
“ jesty would, in a like case, have adopted the most moderate
“ course. I therefore told the Council, that the King did not
“ consider the complaints against the Jesuits sufficiently es-
“ tablished; but that he was resolved to put the question of ba-
“ nishing or retaining them upon the manner in which they
“ should conduct themselves, both towards the State and him-
“ self: above all, that until the King should give more po-
“ sitive orders, he prohibited any violent proceedings against
“ the Jesuits, or any criminating pleadings—**NO ONE EXPECT-**
“ **ED TO FIND IN ME A PROTECTOR OF THE JESUITS.**”—See
Memoires de Sully, Vol. ii. p. 354—Edit. 1768.

The importance of this quotation must apologize for its length: it will appear from it, that MR. DALLAS extracts a single phrase from the long statement of SULLY, leaving it to be inferred from that insulated passage, denuded of its context, that SULLY had at least a leaning towards the Jesuits; while it is clear, from the whole statement, that he dreaded

and disliked them, and acted only from the impulse of a prudent policy in interposing the authority of the King to prevent their banishment, because, at that moment, he had every reason to fear its political consequences.

In p. 27 MR. DALLAS endeavours to overthrow the Evidence against CHATEL, who aimed at the life of HENRY IV. by asserting that the crime imputed to him is “ WITHOUT A “ SHADOW OF PROOF.” There is an effrontery in this assertion which requires distinct refutation. Let us hear SULLY’s account of the matter, who states that he was HIMSELF PRESENT when HENRY’s life was attempted. “ On the 26th of December, 1595” (says SULLY), “ the King was in the Chamber of the Louvre, where he was giving audience to *Messieurs de Ragny and de Montigny*, with whom a large crowd had entered; as he was in the act of stooping to salute one of them, he received a wound in his face from a knife which the assassin dropped, in the hope of escaping in the crowd. *I was present—*Observing the King all over blood, and fearing that the wound was in the throat, I approached him more dead than alive. He received us with mildness and composure, and we soon saw that he had in fact sustained no other injury than a cut lip, for the blow had been aimed too high, and had been stopped by a tooth which it had broken: the Criminal was discovered without difficulty, although concealed in the crowd; he was a student named JEAN CHATEL: he replied to the first questions which were put to him, that he had come from the COLLEGE OF JESUITS, AND HE BITTERLY REPROACHED THOSE FATHERS. The King, who heard him, said, with a vivacity which few could have evinced on such an occasion, that he already knew from the mouths of many respectable persons, that the Society did not love him, but that he had just been convinced of it *from his own mouth*. CHATEL was delivered up to justice; and the proceedings against the Jesuits, which had been suspended, being revived with greater vigour than ever, they terminated in the expulsion of that

“ Order ; their Father GUIGNARD was hung for his criminal writings against the authority and lives of Kings; JEAN GUERET, PIERRE VARADE, ALEXANDRE MAYUS, FRANÇOIS JACOB, and JEAN LEBEL, MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY, were sentenced to perpetual banishment as accomplices in this crime.”—See Mémoires de Sully, Vol. ii. Book 7, p. 448, Edit. 1768.

If the above Extract should not be thought conclusive, the following History will further demonstrate with what an utter contempt for historical testimony MR. DALLAS has asserted that the crime of CHATEL is “ without a shadow of proof.”

In p. 29 MR. DALLAS quotes M. LALLY TOLENDAL in favor of the Jesuits, as he had before done in p. 16.

The citation of *living testimonies* is always open to certain objections not necessary to be here enumerated : whatever may have been the motives which induced M. LALLY TOLENDAL to come forward in favor of the Jesuits, it is somewhat difficult to persuade ourselves to attach any great importance to the opinion of a man who voted for MARSHAL NEY. Undoubtedly, if M. LALLY TOLENDAL believed that signal culprit to have been innocent, he did perfectly right in voting for his acquittal ; but, in entertaining such an opinion, the great majority of mankind will consider him as having acted, not only without sufficient reason, but in utter defiance of all reason :—is it not possible then, that he may have permitted himself to be equally deceived upon the question of the guilt or innocence of the Jesuits ; and if he should have been so deceived, is it any reason that we should deliver up our judgments to him, and determine to be deceived also ?

MR. DALLAS makes (in pp. 28 and 34) an attempt to invalidate the testimony given against the Jesuits by the EXTRAIT DES ASSERTIONS, certainly upon no better grounds than in other instances of disputed authorities.

These EXTRAIT DES ASSERTIONS are no other than the assertions extracted in the year 1761 by the Parliament of Paris from the writings of the Jesuits themselves, and laid be-

fore the King in proof of the criminality of the Order: a work which presents to posterity an indelible record of the corrupt morality of the Society as authorized by its superiors: there are above two thousand Extracts from the Jesuits' own writings thus verified by the Parliament. The propositions contained in these Extracts had already been condemned by the Popes Alexander VII. Innocent XI. and Alexander VIII.; by the Sorbonne; by many of the first Prelates, and particularly by M. DE GONDRIN and the others who answered and censured the Jesuits' *Apology for the Casuists*; as also by the Assembly of the Clergy in 1700, of whose movements the celebrated BOSSUET was the main spring. The General of the Society had never disowned or censured the authors of these works, nor had the Superiors of the Society retracted their approbation of them; but, on the contrary, they had been reprinted several times during the whole century preceding the period when the Parliament made the Extracts in question.

The charge, therefore, of MR. DALLAS, that the *Extraits des Assertions* are "a work replete with studied fabrications," will not avail him; and with respect to the answer which BEAUMONT, the Archbishop of Paris (or some one for him), gave to this work, in the *Instruction de M. de Beaumont*, it is only necessary to refer to the character hereafter given of that Prelate, in order to judge what degree of credit is due to his testimony in this matter*.

It is easy to account for the quarrel of MR. DALLAS and the other friends of the Jesuits with the Extracts drawn from those accredited writings in which the Casuists so fully developed what has been called "*l'art de chicaner avec Dieu*." A considerable degree of anger must always be excited by the exposure which the Jesuits suffered by the publication of such

* The notorious illiteracy of this Prelate (to say nothing of other parts of his character) was almost proverbial: it is impossible to advert to his name, without being reminded of the Episcopal question, "*Avez vous lu mon Mandement?*" to which a wag replied, by asking another question, "*Monseigneur, l'avez vous lu?*"

Documents. The Parliament of 1761 only followed the example of the Clergy of Paris, who also published Extracts from the then existing writings of the Jesuits, a full Century before; and both these Bodies had the highest authority for such a step: “OUT OF THINE OWN MOUTH will I judge thee, “thou wicked Servant.”—*Luke*, xix. 22.

The Jesuits and their advocates find it easier to deal with general statements, than with specific facts; and it is therefore no matter of surprise, that, when they are pressed by such arguments as these, they should lose all patience, and substitute invective for reasoning.

The next Historian whose testimony is sought to be invalidated is PRYNNE.

It would have been strange indeed if HE had been spared, since it was principally owing to his exertions that the designs of the Jesuits and their adherents of the Catholic religion in the end of the reign of James I. and throughout that of Charles I. were detected and defeated. The character of such a writer can no more escape the aspersions of those who defend the Jesuits and their friends at this time, than PRYNNE himself could escape the resentment of the Jesuits and their friends when he lived. The offence of PRYNNE is too deep to be forgiven, and too recent to be forgotten; since the body of Evidence collected and brought forward by him against the Jesuits and Papists, is one of the most important links in the chain of the History of Popery in England.

When the unjust and tyrannical Court of the Star Chamber had determined to silence, by whatever means, the loud and general remonstrances which were heard throughout the nation against the revival of Popery, and its inseparable attendant, Arbitrary Power, they began by inflicting the most cruel and odious punishments upon those who had been instrumental in apprizing the people of the measures which were in agitation. The persons who were principally singled out, were DR. BURTON, a Clergyman of the Church of England, DR. BASTWICK, a Physician, and MR. PRYNNE, a Barrister; who

were all subjected to the heaviest fines, and the most severe and ignominious punishments, the effect of which steps, on the part of the Court, was directly contrary to what was intended: the Protestants of England, so far from being awed into submission by the terrors of this example, espoused the cause of the accused, and went the length of honouring them by a public triumph—From this moment, PRYNNE enjoyed the confidence of the chief opponents of the Jesuits and Roman Catholics; and it must be confessed, that if considerable depth and vigour of intellect, an unabated ardour in the pursuit of his object, and a large share of legal and juridical knowledge, entitled any one to take a prominent part in a question of the deepest national concern, PRYNNE was eminently that man. The portion of personal feeling which may be supposed to have operated with PRYNNE after the punishment inflicted on him, ought undoubtedly to be taken into the account in judging of the degree of credit to be attached to his testimony; but not, as MR. DALLAS would insinuate, to discredit that testimony, even if it stood singly. Fortunately, however, for the interests of truth, his writings do not rest upon his own statements alone, but are amply sustained by the facts he adduces, as well as by much other concurrent testimony of that particular period.

MR. DALLAS refers us for an account of PRYNNE to HUME, the well-known advocate of arbitrary power; who, with his characteristic levity and contempt for religion, notices one of PRYNNE's works, from which he takes occasion, as usual, to sneer at Piety under the name of Puritanism. PRYNNE, however, published several others, which it did not perhaps answer the purpose of HUME and MR. DALLAS to mention: one was on “THE TREACHERY AND DISLOYALTY OF PAPISTS TO THEIR “SOVEREIGNS IN DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE, AND THE POWER “OF PARLIAMENTS.” This work had two objects—first, to shew that the Papists and Jesuits, both in England and elsewhere, had been invariably the advocates of Popery as well as the assertors of arbitrary power, either to be exercised by them-

selves, or by Princes under their influence, to the exclusion of all lawful sovereigns who might oppose them; and, secondly, that the Parliament of England, as composed of the three Estates of the realm, was the only legitimate form of Government for England, as also *that* under which alone she could really prosper; and he refers the principal errors of the reign of Charles I. as well as that King's subsequent misfortunes, to his affection for Popery, and his desire to reign without Parliaments. Another work from his pen was, "ROME'S MASTER-PIECE, OR THE GRAND CONSPIRACY OF THE POPE AND HIS JESUITICAL INSTRUMENTS TO EXTER-
"PATE THE PROTESTANT RELIGION AND RE-ESTABLISH PO-
"PERY;" the chief object of which was, to develope the designs of the Jesuits against the life of Charles I. as also against the then existing Government: which designs he establishes from some very important documents discovered by him at Lambeth among the papers of Archbishop Laud, which were laid by him before the King, and afterwards proved on oath before the Parliament. We have also his Account of THE TRIAL OF THAT ARCHBISHOP; including the evidence adduced on the trial, which shews that the Popish Secretary of State WINDEBANK (who afterwards fled the Kingdom), CARDINAL BARBERINI (the nephew of Pope Urban VIII.), the Pope's Nuncio CUNEUS, THE ENGLISH JESUITS, and THE CATHOLIC PRIESTS, were all engaged in a league throughout the first years of the reign of King Charles I. (in which they were abetted by his Popish Queen*), to establish their own religion

* See, in *Ludlow's Three Letters from the Hague*, "a Letter from Pope Gregory the Fifteenth to King Charles the First, in the year 1623, when he was Prince of Wales, and was gone to Spain in the hope of marrying Donna Maria, the daughter of Philip the Third, King of Spain; who was the son of Philip the Second, the cruellest and most tyrannical King in Europe; who had invaded England with a powerful Fleet and Army in the year 1588, with a view of thoroughly reducing it under his dominion, and re-establishing in it the Papal religion, with its usual appendage, the persecution of Protest-

in England, and to destroy the then order of things: and it may be observed, that these facts, so far from resting on the testimony of PRYNNE alone, are amply confirmed by MAY in his "History of the Long Parliament;" a work strongly recommended by Warburton (in his Correspondence with Hurd which has lately appeared), and by Lord Chatham (in his Letters to a noble Relative recently published), as the most faithful and elegant History of those times. The same view of the subject is also taken by the following writers, and it appears to be fully proved by their works: viz. May's Breviary; The Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles; Collection of State Papers, by Husbands; Lilly's History of that period;

ants or Heretics. Into this most bigoted, Popish, royal family was this Prince, at that time, ambitious of entering: though the match was afterwards broke off by some accident or other, and then he married another Popish Princess, named Henrietta Maria, the sister of Louis the Thirteenth, King of France, who was very much bigoted to the Popish Religion, and very desirous of introducing it into England; and who, by her pernicious advice to her husband in matters of Religion and Government (in which he was weak enough to let himself be guided by her), led him into many of the bad measures that gave rise to the misfortunes of his reign. There was, therefore, good reason for the suspicions that many of his subjects entertained of his being himself a Papist, though he always declared himself a Protestant, and even at the approach of death. But at least, it is certain that (if he were a Protestant) he was not such a sort of Protestant as (for the good of the English nation, and the preservation of their religion) a King of England ought to be; or it would never have come into his head to marry a Popish Princess. And whoever reads the Letter of Pope Gregory XV. to him, when he was in Spain (which is inserted in the third Letter of General Ludlow), and then reads the Prince's answer to it (which is also there inserted), will be disposed to think, that the Protestant Gentlemen of England in that time (*who were real believers in their religion, and not persons who thought little about the matter, and complied with the religion of the Kingdom merely because they found it established*) were very excusable for entertaining some suspicions that the King was secretly inclined to Popery, notwithstanding his declarations to the contrary:—"Preface by MR. BARON MASERES to his Edition of Ludlow's Three Letters from the Hague."

Sir John Temple's History of the Massacre of the Protestants in Ireland ; Baxter's Life and Times ; Whitlock's Memorials ; Sir John Berkley's Memoirs ; Clement Walker's History of Independency ; Ludlow's Memoirs, and particularly his Three Letters from the Hague ; Fairfax's Memorial ; and a variety of contemporary works ; some of which have been lately republished by MR. BARON MASERES, who is well known to have paid particular attention to this interesting period of English History, and who, on the subject of the quarrel of King Charles with his Parliament, and the importance of the Protestant Succession, expresses himself as follows in his Preface to the *Select Tracts relating to the Civil Wars in England* : “ This part of the History of England is generally considered as more interesting than that of any other preceding period of it, because it contains an account of the grand struggle between King Charles I. and the people of England (acting under the direction of the famous *Long Parliament*, that met on the 3rd of November, 1640), to determine ‘ whether he should be permitted to govern them by his sole will and pleasure, as an absolute Monarch, and without the assistance of a Parliament (as he had done very lately for ten years together, before the Civil War begun), or whether he should be compelled to consent to admit the two Houses of Parliament to a participation of the *Legislative* authority with him,—so that no new Law could be made, nor any old one be repealed or altered, nor any new tax be imposed upon the people, without their joint consent ; to which participation of the Legislative Power with the two Houses of Parliament, all the Kings of England, his predecessors, ever since the creation of the House of Commons by King Edward I. in the twenty-third year of his reign, A.D. 1295, had uniformly consented, as to a known and established maxim of Government.’ ”

“ This was the real subject of the dispute between King Charles and his Parliament : for, as to the *Executive*

“ Power of the State ; or the right of causing justice to be
“ administered to his people, according to known Laws already
“ duly established, and of appointing proper judges for that
“ purpose ; and the right of making war and peace with
“ foreign nations, and of levying soldiers, by free contracts
“ with them, to serve him out of the dominions of the Crown
“ of England, against such foreign enemies, and of appointing
“ the Commanders, and other Officers of the Soldiers so levied
“ for foreign service—and the right of levying the Militia of
“ England to suppress a rebellion, or to resist an invasion of
“ England by a foreign enemy, but without going out of the
“ dominions of the Crown :—all these powers, great as they
“ are, and dangerous to public liberty as they would be, if they
“ were abused, yet were allowed to belong to the King ; and
“ no intention to change the English Monarchy, into a popular
“ Government, or Commonwealth, was then entertained by
“ any considerable number of the Members of that Parlia-
“ ment, or of the People of England, by whom they had been
“ elected.

“ The real question, therefore, which gave rise to that
“ famous Civil War, was, ‘ whether the English nation should
“ thenceforward be governed by the King alone, or by the
“ King and Parliament conjointly ;’ or, in other words of the
“ same import, ‘ whether they should be governed as slaves to
“ the will of an absolute Monarch, possessing the power of
“ an Emperor of Morocco, or as a free people, who, in times
“ of peace and domestic tranquillity, had a considerable share
“ in making and amending the laws by which they were to be
“ governed ;’ and therefore it is most happy for the English
“ nation, that the Parliament was successful in this contest :
“ for it is to this success, together with the subsequent glo-
“ rious Revolution, in the year 1688, under the great King
“ William, that we owe the degree of civil liberty, security
“ of person and property, and other advantages of a wise
“ and equitable Government, which we now enjoy, and
“ have enjoyed ever since that great event ; and, more

“ especially, since the succession of the Princes of the House
“ of Hanover to the Throne of these Kingdoms, upon the
“ death of Queen Anne, in the year 1714, in consequence of
“ the wise and noble Act of Parliament, generally known by
“ the name of the *Act of Settlement*, which was passed in the
“ latter part of King William’s reign, for excluding all the
“ Popish branches of the Royal Family, and likewise all such
“ members of it as shall hereafter embrace that hostile and
“ intolerant Religion, from their right of succeeding to the
“ Crown; and neither of these two great events, the Revo-
“ lution in 1688, and the succession of the Hanover Family
“ to the Crown in 1714, would probably have taken place,
“ if King Charles had been successful in that contest with
“ his Parliament.” — Preface to “ Select Tracts relating to
“ the Civil Wars in England, in the Reign of King Charles I.”

MR. BARON MASERES further observes, in his Preface to “ Ludlow’s Three Letters,” “ The people of England had
“ as much reason to be dissatisfied with the oppressive and
“ illegal government of King Charles I. in the first four years
“ of his reign, as their successors had to be dissatisfied with the
“ oppressive and illegal acts of the whole four years of the
“ reign of King James II.; and if the resistance to King
“ James II. for his tyrannical proceedings (which produced
“ his abdication of the Crown) was justifiable and even laud-
“ able, it must surely be allowed that the resistance of the Par-
“ liament of November, 1640, to King Charles I. must like-
“ wise have been justifiable and laudable. It is to the wise and
“ vigorous proceedings of that Parliament, in the two or three
“ first years of their continuance, and before they were dis-
“ turbed and overawed by the mutinous conduct of their own
“ victorious armies, after the King was made a Prisoner, that
“ the subjects of the Kingdom of England, after the restora-
“ tion of the monarchy in 1660, have been principally indebt-
“ ed for the several political privileges and advantages that
“ have exalted their condition above that of the subjects of

“ France and Spain, and most of the other monarchies of
“ Europe.”

A passage in *Millar's Historical View of the English Government* may serve to confirm the correctness of the above remarks:

“ The first fifteen years of the reign of CHARLES I. presented nearly the same view of political parties which had occurred in the reign of his Father; the King eagerly demanding supplies; threatening that, unless his demands were complied with, he must have recourse to other methods of procuring money, and declaring, that as the existence of Parliaments depended entirely upon his Will, they must expect, according to their behaviour, either to be continued or laid aside;—Parliament, on the other hand, with inflexible resolution, insisting upon the previous redress of grievances; its members imprisoned and called to account for their behaviour in that assembly; repeated dissolutions of Parliament, for its perseverance in refusing to grant the Sums demanded; and each dissolution followed by the arbitrary exactions of Loans and Benevolences, and by such other expedients as the Crown could put in practice for procuring money.”

“ From the whole behaviour of the King during this period; from numberless instances in which he declared his political sentiments; from the countenance and favor which he shewed to the authors of doctrines entirely subversive of civil liberty; from his peremptory demands of supply accompanied with menaces, in case they should not be complied with; from his repeated dissolutions of Parliament, for persisting to inquire into national grievances; and from his continuing, in consequence of an avowed resolution, for so long a period as that of eleven years, to rule without the aid of any national Council, and to levy money, both directly and indirectly, by his own authority; from all these circumstances it is manifest, that he considered himself as an absolute Monarch, and that although he made repeated applications to

“ Parliament for supplies, he was far from admitting the necessity of such an expedient, but claimed the power of imposing Taxes as an inherent right of the Crown.”—“ To the illustrious Patriots, who remained unshaken during this period, we are indebted, in a good measure, for the preservation of that freedom which was banished from most of the other Countries of Europe. They set the example of a constitutional resistance to the encroachments of prerogative; accommodated their mode of defence to the variations in the state of Society which the times had produced, and taught the House of Commons, by a judicious use of their exclusive right of taxation, to maintain and secure the rights of their constituents.”

Of the Long Parliament too, MILLAR speaks in the following terms:—“ Whoever,” says he, “ examines with attention the proceedings of this Parliament, from their first meeting to the commencement of the Civil War, will easily perceive that their views were somewhat different from those of the four preceding Parliaments; and perhaps will find reason to conclude, that they did not continue through the whole of this period, invariably the same. It was the object of this Parliament, to reform such parts of the Constitution as were grossly defective; but their plan of reformation was necessarily varied, and extended according to the pressure of circumstances. That the Parliament had, at this time, any intention to overturn the Monarchy, and to establish a republican form of Government, there is no good reason to suppose: after all the regulations which this Parliament introduced, the Sovereign still remained in the possession of very ample powers: he still would have enjoyed a voice in the Legislature: he would still have exercised the power of collecting and disposing of the Public Revenue. He would still have remained the fountain of honour; would have nominated all the Judges during pleasure, and have had the sole privilege of declaring Peace and War, with that of levy-

“ ing and commanding all the mercenary forces of the King-
“ dom. In a word, his direct authority would have been more
“ absolute than that of the British Monarch at present.”

“ With respect to the conduct of CHARLES during this
“ period, we meet with no important variation: the same
“ arbitrary system invariably pursued, and by the same un-
“ scrupulous means of dissimulation and duplicity: to those
“ indeed who look no further than the immediate transactions,
“ and who are unable to trace the intentions and motives of the
“ Parties, it may seem that the ground of the dispute had been
“ changed, while Parliament was labouring to introduce a set
“ of palpable innovations, and the King, who certainly con-
“ sented to these with reluctance, is represented to us in the
“ light of a secret friend to the old constitution. This is the
“ aspect of the controversy which those Authors who attempt
“ to excuse or justify the Monarch, are at great pains to ex-
“ hibit, and to which they would willingly confine the atten-
“ tion of the reader. They endeavour to conceal or keep out
“ of view the former measures of the Sovereign, by which he
“ had subverted the fundamental Laws of the Kingdom, and
“ the evidence which had occurred of his obstinate resclution
“ to persist in the same designs. Thus they impute to Parlia-
“ ment, the offences in reality committed by the King, and
“ represent as violations of the constitution the regulations
“ which had become absolutely necessary for its preservation;
“ that is, they consider as a poison the antidote given to pre-
“ vent its baneful effects.”

Now, if the above views be correct (and with the body of evidence, which BARON MASERES, and the Authors whose works he has republished, have collected in their favor, it will not be easy to prove them otherwise), then is PRYNNE entitled to the gratitude of all succeeding times, for the conspicuous part taken by him in exposing the intrigues of Popery, resisting arbitrary power, and maintaining the privileges of the British Parliament, and the liberties of the people of England.

MR. DALLAS's statement, therefore, that PRYNNE was "a 'factious agent" (p. 35), "a thorough-paced puritan," and "a Libeller" (p. 36), will not suffice to overthrow his testimony. There is nothing easier than to call names ; and the imputation of *factious* is as old as the age of the Apostles, when the chief of that chosen band was called "a pestilent "fellow," a "mover of sedition, and the ringleader of a sect" (Acts, xxiv, 5).

MR. DALLAS's assertion, that PRYNNE attacked THE CHURCH, is not correct, unless he means the Church of ROME : he certainly attacked those Members of the Church of England, who (like ARCHBISHOP LAUD, BISHOP MONTAGUE, and HEYLIN), appeared determined to bring in Popery, against the wishes of the People of England ; and who shewed its Professors and Ministers such honour and patronage, as appeared to PRYNNE and others, to be inconsistent with the safety and existence of the Church of England.

So far was PRYNNE from giving any countenance to the excesses of the Parliament or the Army, that he invariably opposed the irregularities of both, to the utmost of his power, both by his public conduct, and his printed works ; and he also attacked the usurpation of CROMWELL with so much vigour, that he was actually imprisoned by that military Demagogue : so far also was PRYNNE from displaying any hostility to Monarchy or regular government, as such, that he was eminently instrumental in restoring CHARLES II. to the Throne, and gave his most strenuous support to the legal and established government, which was effected by the Restoration of the lawful Monarch.

MR. DALLAS next attempts (p. 35) to discredit the testimony of DE THOU.

This great Historian enjoyed the confidence of HENRY III. of France, by whom he was employed in Normandy, Picardy, Germany, and Venice ; his knowledge and integrity recommended him to his Successor HENRY IV. who made him his Privy Counsellor, and relied on him in the most important

négociations. He placed him at the head of the Royal Library ; an office (say the French Biographers) worthy of his erudition. The same King appointed him one of his Commissioners, on the part of the Catholics, in the celebrated Conference at Fontainebleau, during the Regency of Mary de Medicis. This distinguished character was one of the Directors General of Finance ; he was deputed to the conference of Loudun, and employed in other affairs of the greatest consequence, in all of which it was difficult to decide whether his honesty, or his talents were most conspicuous. His intimate acquaintance with the best classical authors, his profound researches, and his extensive travels, his knowledge of the manners, the customs, and the geography of various countries, eminently qualified him for that stupendous work, the History of his own Time (from 1545 to 1607); a work which involves all the great interests of policy, war, and letters, during a most interesting period. The impartiality and intelligence which are displayed in this performance, have been the theme of general admiration : his reflections are elevated, and yet judicious ; and although his details are sometimes elaborate and diffuse, the eloquence with which they are relieved may be permitted to atone for this defect. DE THOU, however, although himself a Catholic, was too enlightened, not to observe the crooked and secular policy of the Church of Rome, and too honest to suppress the result of his observations. He speaks, therefore, with freedom, of worldly-minded Popes, of a licentious Clergy (whether Jesuits or not), and of the treacherous House of Guise ; and he evinces considerable liberality and candour towards Protestants. “ *Hinc illæ lacrymæ !*”

Such a line of conduct could not fail to attract many foes. He was accused of heterodoxy by some, and of heresy by others: this excited no surprise in his own mind, and it is thus that he refutes the imputations which had arisen, in a Letter to the President *Jeannin*. “ I call God to witness” (says he), “ that I have only had his glory, and the public “ good, in view, in having composed my History with the most

“ scrupulous and uncorrupted fidelity of which I was capable,
“ without suffering myself to be influenced by friendship or
“ by hatred. I admit that many have the advantage of me
“ in a more agreeable style, in a superior mode of narration,
“ and in the depth of their reflections and maxims; but I will
“ yield to no Historian who has preceded me, in fidelity and
“ correctness. I could easily foresee that I should draw
“ upon myself the hatred of many persons, and the event has
“ shewn that I was not mistaken. Scarcely had the first part
“ of my History appeared in 1604, than I experienced the
“ animosity of many, who, by artifice and calumny, excited
“ some Courtiers against me, who (as you know) are not
“ themselves the best judges of subjects of this kind. They
“ carried the matter to ROME, where, after having condemned
“ me, they easily brought about the condemnation of a work
“ (by means of prejudiced Censors) of which they had not
“ perused one third*.”

Perhaps, however, MR. DALLAS may object to DE THOU's account of himself. Let him hear then what the great LORD MANSFIELD said of him and his History, in his celebrated speech in the House of Lords, in the cause of *The Chamber-*

* See *Dictionnaire Historique*, Article DE THOU.—By the Bull *In cæna Domini*, which no Pope has as yet retracted, all persons who should read any Book composed by Heretics, were excommunicated. Father Paul mentioning the first Index of prohibited Books which was published at Rome, in 1559, says, among other things, that, under pretext of Religion, the Pope in this, consigned to excommunication the authors of all works, in which the authority of Princes and Magistrates was supported against the usurpation of Ecclesiastics: besides which, the Romish Inquisitors prohibited, in the mass, all books printed by sixty-two printers who were named, which works they denounced, without any regard to their contents; adding further a general prohibition to read any book issuing from the press of any printer, who but once in his life had printed any thing produced by an Heretic.—By this means (says the Historian) nothing was left to read, and never was a better secret discovered to paralyze and corrupt men by Religion.—See History of the Council of Trent, book vi.

lain of London against Evans: he there speaks of him as
“ that great man, who, though a Papist, had dared to advance
“ so many admirable things in the dedication of his History
“ to Henry IV. a History which” (says Lord Mansfield) “ I
“ NEVER READ WITHOUT RAPTURE.”

It was DE THOU whom the great and learned GROTIUS esteemed above all others, and with whom he preserved a friendship and maintained a correspondence, till the hour of his death.

It is at this character, that MR. DALLAS “ first casts a
“ stone !”

To furnish any further eulogiums on DE THOU would be to write a volume. Let his own works praise him. Let the general esteem in which the world has agreed to hold them (with the exception only of certain partisans, who cannot bear the truth) suffice to wipe out the aspersions which have been cast upon him by the author of the Letters in THE PILOT NEWSPAPER, and the Popish Journal, which MR. DALLAS has thought proper to make his own. Finally, let the unsuccessful efforts of the Court of Rome, to stifle the evidence collected by DE THOU, and a multitude of other Historians, while they afford a strong argument in favor of those writers, serve to establish more fully the narrow and perverted policy of suppressing facts, because they do not tend to the credit of the Romish Church; a policy which would sacrifice truth itself to the interests of a particular system, and would keep the whole world in darkness, rather than that the delinquencies of Popery, and her twin sister Jesuitism, should be exposed.

MR. DALLAS next ventures on a little bush-fighting with the elaborate and faithful History of RAPIN; not daring, as it should seem, to hazard an attack in front.

He complains, “ that he finds in the pages of RAPIN, the names of Jesuit and Catholic indiscriminately used as accused of plots:” and, whom has MR. DALLAS to censure for this? Certainly not the Historian, but those faithful Bre-

thren, who, true to each other, and to their cause, were thus indiscriminately engaged in plots, of which RAPIN records the failure. If the names of Jesuits and Catholics are indiscriminately found in the pages of RAPIN, what are we to infer from this, but that, if the same persons are found again in this Protestant nation, they will be indiscriminately engaged in the same pious work?

MR. DALLAS, however, finds that “ the Jesuits confuted “ the accusations brought against them by the most persuasive “ simplicity of their *protestations of innocence* ;” and blames “ a writer of 1815 for citing *the pretended plots*, in the days of “ Elizabeth, and of the Stuarts.”

If *protestations* of innocence were to be admitted as *proofs* of innocence, MR. DALLAS might contend with greater probability, that the plots of the Jesuits through the five reigns of Elizabeth, Charles I. and II. and James I. and II. were only **PRETENDED**. Let us, however, examine this assertion.

The greater part of the offenders in the above instances were charged with having designed the destruction of the lawful Sovereigns of the land. In addition, therefore, to the ordinary crime of murder, the treason which it involved against the highest authorities, and a sense of the distraction and uproar which might be reasonably expected to ensue, rendered such a species of crime peculiarly detestable to the people of England. Now, it has ever been found that most of those who rank in the worst class of offenders declare their innocence to the last, especially in cases where the offence is not deposed to by an eye-witness of the fact, and frequently where it is, it being attempted, in the latter case, to affect the credit of such witness, as perjured or suborned. It has often been found that the dread of general odium and indignation is the last surviving principle in the human breast: it is dearer than life itself; and many who have not feared to die, have, in all ages, shrunk from the complete forfeiture of character which a confession of their crime would involve. They could dare

and endure every thing, but the loss of public opinion. This is no matter of speculation or theory ; but the history of crime in every period and every nation will abundantly confirm it—

“ Entendons discourir sur les bancs des galères,
 “ Ce forçat abhorré même de ses confrères ;
 “ Il plaint par un arrêt injustement donné,
 “ L’honneur en sa personne à ramer condamné.”—BOILEAU*.

Without looking back to antiquity, we have two remarkable examples in our own time of the most resolute denial of guilt, in cases respecting which no honest man could entertain any doubt. The first is that of MARSHAL NEY in France, which has been alluded to before ; and the second, that of LORD COCHRANE in England, who, being accused of a crime which no gentleman ought to have committed, endeavoured to falsify the evidence of disinterested witnesses, impeached the decision of a Jury, which was sworn to decide upon the evidence, and insulted a Judge who, in every man’s mind but the Prisoner’s, was elevated above all suspicion of any bias against him.

It was probably upon the same principle that the Jesuits, charged as they were with crimes of the deepest die, crimes which in the Professors of religion assumed greater aggravation than in the case of common men, determined on denying, to the last, the accusations which had been brought.

But further ; in estimating the value of the Jesuits’ “ protestations of innocence,” it must be considered, that the interests of their own Church, and of their Brethren then in England, required that they should not avow their guilt, on

* LEVIZAC, in a note on the above passage, relates an anecdote of the Duke of Ossonia, a Vice Roy of Sicily and Naples, who, on visiting the Galleys, had the curiosity to interrogate the criminals : they all on that occasion, with one accord, declared their entire innocence of the crimes of which they had been convicted, with the exception, however, of one prisoner, who honestly admitted that he was guilty, and had deserved even a worse fate than he had experienced ; upon which the Vice Roy exclaimed (releasing him from bondage), “ Take that rascal away ! he will only corrupt all these honest people.”

account of the scandal which would have accrued to the Romish Communion, and the danger which might have ensued to others. They might also have imagined that all necessary purposes had been answered, if they had confessed to the Priests by whom they were attended, without the addition of a public confession; which, while it could not save their own lives, would only commit their own cause*. When to these considerations are added the doctrines of casuistry which justify rebellion, and divest it of its guilt; the merit of a good intention, which sanctifies the end in view, by the use of any means to obtain it; and the duty of obedience to Papal authority; we may perhaps come to some more correct conclusions upon the importance to be attached to a Jesuit's "protestations "of innocence," than if such reflections were laid out of sight†.

* The following passage from BURNET will prove that *he* did not value very highly the Jesuits' "protestations of innocence." "One "Serjeant, a secular Priest, who had been always on ill terms with the "Jesuits, and was a zealous Papist in his own way, appeared before "the Council, upon security given him; and he averred that Gawen "the Jesuit, who died protesting he had never thought it lawful to "murder Kings, but had always detested it, had at his last being in "Flanders, said to a very devout person from whom Serjeant had it, "that he thought the Queen might lawfully take away the King's life, "for the injuries he had done her, but much more, because he was a "Heretic: upon that, Serjeant run out into many particulars to shew "how little credit was due to the protestations made by Jesuits even at their "death."—Burnet's Own Times, Vol. ii. p. 153, Edit. 1724.

† BURNET, it appears, would not believe those who were NOT Jesuits under circumstances where their religion was opposed to their veracity—"Sir Edward Hales" (says he), "a gentleman of a noble "family in Kent, now declared himself a Papist, though he had "long disguised it; and had once to myself so solemnly denied it, that "I was led from thence to see there was no credit to be given to that "sort of men, where their Church or Religion was concerned." Burnet's History of his own Times, Vol. ii. p. 379, Edit. 1724—And BAXTER was much of the same opinion; for he says, "The King" (Charles II.) "that "week, by himself and the Chancellor, acquainted them that he should "consent to any thing reasonable to secure the Protestant Religion, not

MR. DALLAS however asserts, that these “*pretended plots*” have been “cited against the *toleration of the Catholics*.”

It is not true that they have been cited with any such object: they have been adduced to shew, that Jesuits cannot be tolerated with safety to this country, and that Catholics cannot safely succeed to power or influence in the State; whether the argument which they afford to this point, together with the other arguments to the same point, which have been brought forward, go to establish it, let the country judge. It is the less necessary here to notice the sophistry which imputes to all those who cannot see with MR. DALLAS’s eyes, a refusal to *tolerate the Catholics*, because that imputation has been considered before. The Catholics enjoy, and may they ever enjoy, the most ample toleration: no man who values religious freedom and loves his country, would wish that they should have less; but surely many of the best friends of Toleration may still be excused for refusing the Catholics the power to act intolerantly towards those whom they call *Heretics*, without at the same time being charged with refusing to tolerate the Catholics.

To resume the subject of THE POPISH PLOTS: MR. DALLAS, in order to shew they were only PRETENDED, refers us to “DR. MILNER’s Letters to a Prebendary,” and he is certainly entitled to all the benefit which he can derive from the evidence of A POPISH BISHOP. He then passes to the assertions, or rather asseverations, of MR. FOX, respecting the Plot of the Jesuits in the reign of Charles II: although, from the manner in which the passage is quoted, MR. DALLAS’s readers are left to guess what Plot Mr. Fox alludes to; and, indeed, it is

“alienating the Crown from the line of succession, and particularly “that he would consent, that till the successor” (James II.) “should “take the test, he should exercise no act of government. This offer “took much with many; but most said that it signified nothing; FOR “PAPISTS HAVE EASILY DISPENSATIONS TO TAKE ANY TESTS OR “OATHS.”—Baxter’s Life and Times, part iii. p. 185.

only by reference to MR. Fox's work that any one can discover. It is impossible to acquit MR. DALLAS of a reprehensible (not to say intentional) ambiguity on this subject; for, immediately after his quotation from Mr. Fox as to this Plot, he has these words: "Speaking of one of the imaginary Popish Plots, Mr. Fox expresses himself thus," &c.: whereas, in fact, Mr. Fox is at that moment speaking of this same Plot in the reign of Charles II. and of no other. The Plot in question is that which concerned Lord Stafford and other Catholic Peers, the Jesuits Whitebread, Fenwick, Gowan, Turner, Harcourt, Coleman, and Ireland; and the under-plot connected with it, viz. the murder of Sir Edmonbury Godfrey; in which affairs, Oates, Bedloe, Dugdale, Tongue, Turberville, and Pranse, were the principal witnesses.

It is sincerely to be wished, for the credit of MR. Fox, that he had contented himself with a statement of the Evidence which was actually given on both sides, in some such manner as BURNET has detailed it in his History of his own Times; rather than that he should have committed himself to such an indecent attack upon "the King, Parliament, Judges, "Juries, Witnesses, and Prosecutors," for their conduct at this important juncture. Had he attended to the cautious way in which BURNET (who lived through the whole period alluded to, and possessed the best means of information), as well as others, have examined and balanced the evidence which was produced, it is almost impossible that he could have expressed himself with so much passion and vehemence as he has done: the passage extracted from MR. Fox's work has rather the declamatory character of a popular harangue than that of a sober examination of an historical fact *; and a reference to the authority which has been referred to, as well as

* It is remarkable that MR. Fox says of the Introduction to his History (in which Introduction this very passage is contained), "I have at last finished my Introduction, which, after all, is *more like a speech than it should be.*"—See Lord Holland's Address to the Reader, prefixed to Mr. Fox's History.

of RAPIN's authority on the same subject, will satisfy every reader that MR. FOX's ardent love of liberty, in the pursuit of which favorite object he did not always preserve the greatest moderation or consistency, has transported him in this instance, as in many others, far beyond the limits of "truth and soberness."

MR. FOX himself admits that the belief in the plot was universal (see p. 31); and expressly declares himself as much convinced as RAPIN, that there was a design or project to introduce Popery, at the head of which were the King and his Brother (CHARLES II. AND JAMES II.): but MR. FOX cannot conceive how, if this were the case, the plot in question could have been real; not considering that the Papists were generally believed to have meditated the death of CHARLES II. who was only their concealed friend, in order to make way for JAMES II. who was their open and avowed friend, and who afterwards proved himself so, even to the satisfaction of MR. FOX himself*.

If, therefore, that eminent Politician and Orator, instead of quoting DRYDEN (who was a Papist), in order to prove that the plot was fictitious, had adverted to the evidence which there is for its truth, he would, in all probability, have been deterred from hazarding so positive a declaration as we find, and might have preferred even indecision itself, in a case of conflicting testimony, to the decided and dogmatical tone which he has assumed.—With how much greater dignity and decency does BURNET sum up his reflections on this whole subject, when, after a patient comparison of the contradictory evidence which had been brought forward, he observes, "These things put a man quite in the dark: and in this mist, "matters must be left till the great revelation of all secrets;

* COURTIN'S Letter to LOUIS XIV. in 1677, is well known: "I can answer for it to your Majesty" (says he), "that there are none of your own subjects who wish you better success in all your undertakings than these two Princes do"—(Charles II. and James II.) See DALRYMPLE and others.

“ and there I leave it.”—Burnet’s Own Times, vol. ii. p. 203, Edit. 1724.

“ They are too wise” (says MAY, in his History of the Long Parliament), “ who are not content sometimes to wonder.”

Such persons as are desirous of forming correct conclusions upon the Plot of the Jesuits in the reign of Charles II. and also on the murder of Sir Edmondbury Godfrey (a Protestant Magistrate who had at that time rendered himself obnoxious to the Papists by taking the depositions on the above occasion), may, in addition to BURNET and RAPIN, consult BAXTER’S LIFE AND TIMES, where they will find that no doubt rested on his mind as to the guilt of the Papists and Jesuits in those transactions. It may be observed of BAXTER, that he lived in the period in question, and may be depended upon for an inflexible adherence to truth; nor will MR. DALLAS himself object to his testimony, when he finds that MR. FOX calls him “ a pious and learned Dissenter of exemplary character, always remarkable for his attachment to monarchy, and for leaning to moderate measures in the differences between the Church and those of his persuasion.”—See MR. FOX’S HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF JAMES II. p. 96.

BAXTER thus expresses himself: “ About October, 1678, fell out the murder of Sir Edmondbury Godfrey, which made a very great change in England. One Dr. Titus Oates had discovered a Plot of the Papists, of which he wrote out the particulars very largely; telling how they fired the City, and contriving to bring the Kingdom to Popery, and in order thereto to kill the King: he named the Lords, Jesuits, Priests, and others, that were the chief contrivers, and said that he himself had delivered to several of the Lords their Commissions; that the Lord Bellasis was to be General, the Lord Peters Lieutenant-general, and the Lord Stafford Major-general, the Lord Powis Lord Chancellor, and the Lord Arundel of Wardour to be Lord Treasurer. He told who were to be Archbishops, Bishops,

“ &c. and at what Meetings, and by whom, and when all was
“ contrived, and who were designed to kill the King: he first
“ opened all this to Dr. Tongue, and both of them to the King
“ and Council: he mentioned a multitude of Letters which he
“ himself had carried, and seen, or heard read, that contained
“ all these contrivances; but because his father and he had
“ once been Anabaptists, and when the Bishops prevailed,
“ turned to be Conforming Ministers, and afterwards he (the
“ son) turned Papist, and confessed, that he long had gone
“ on with them, under many Oaths of Secrecy, many thought
“ that a man of so little conscience was not to be believed;
“ but his Confessions were received by some Justices of the
“ Peace, and none more forward in the search than Sir Ed-
“ mondbury Godfrey, an able, honest, and diligent Justice.
“ While he was following this work, he was suddenly missing,
“ and could not be heard of. Three or four days after, he
“ was found killed near Marybone Park: it was plainly found
“ that he was murdered. The Parliament took the alarm
“ upon it, and Oates was now believed; *and, indeed, all his*
“ *large Confessions in every part, agreed to admiration.*
“ Hereupon the King proclaimed pardon and reward to any
“ that would confess, or discover the murder. One Mr. Bed-
“ low, that had fled to Bristol, began and confessed that he
“ knew of it, and who did it, and named some of the men,
“ the place, and time: it was at the Queen’s House, call-
“ ed Somerset House, by Fitzgerald and Kelly, two Popish
“ Priests, and four others, Berry the Porter, Green, Pranse,
“ and Hill. The Priests fled; Pranse, Berry, Green, and
“ Hill were taken: Pranse first confessed all, and discovered
“ the rest aforesaid, more than Bedlow knew of, and all the
“ circumstances; and how he was carried away, and by whom;
“ and also how the Plot was laid to kill the King. Thus
“ Oates’s testimony, seconded by Sir Edmondbury God-
“ frey’s murder, and Bedlow and Pranse’s testimonies, be-
“ came to be generally believed. Ireland, a Jesuit, and two
“ more, were condemned, as designing to kill the King: Hill,

“ Berry, and Green were condemned for the murder of Godfrey, and executed ; but Pranse was, by a Papist, first terrified into a denial of the Plot to kill the King, and took on him to be distracted, but quickly recanted of this, and had no quiet till he told how he was so affrighted, and renewed all his testimony and confession.

“ After this, came in one Mr. Dugdale, a Papist, and confessed the same Plot, and especially the Lord Stafford’s interest in it ; and after him, more and more evidence daily was added.

“ Coleman, the Duchess of York’s Secretary (and one of the Papists’ great plotters and disputers), being surprised, though he made away all his later papers, was hanged by the old ones that were remaining, and by Oates’s testimony. But the Parliament kept off all aspersions from the Duke (afterwards James II.) : the hopes of some, and the fears of others, of his succession, prevailed with many.” * * * “ There came afterwards from among the Papists more and more converts that detected the Plot against Religion and the King : after OATES, BEDLOW, EVERARD, DUGDALE, and PRANSE, came JENNISON, a Gentleman of Gray’s Inn ; SMITH, a Papist ; and others.”—Baxter’s Life and Times, Part iii. pp. 183 and 186.

MR. DALLAS next ventures on an assertion (p. 39), that LORD STAFFORD, who was beheaded for his part in the Plot, was an innocent victim of his pure attachment to God.”

It is difficult to comprehend upon what principle MR. DALLAS has ventured upon so positive an assertion of LORD STAFFORD’s innocence.

BURNET, who was sent for by that nobleman after his condemnation, had frequent communication with him, and appears to have possessed much of his confidence, states that, although he denied any intention of killing the King, he yet admitted to him (BURNET) that he “ could discover *many* ‘other things, that were more material than any thing that was

" yet known, and for which the Duke of York" (afterwards James II.) " would never forgive him ; and of these, if that " might save his life, he would make a full discovery :" in consequence of which, BURNET adds, he was examined by the House of Lords ; but on his endeavouring to criminate THE EARL OF SHAFESBURY, the House would hear no more.

This information goes strongly to shew that LORD STAFFORD had at least been engaged in the design of establishing Popery, as it is otherwise difficult to conceive how any part of his confession could have criminated the Duke of York ; and with respect to the design upon the King's life, which was deposed to by the witness TURBERVILLE, BURNET, after throwing some shade upon that person's testimony, adduces the following remarkable circumstance in corroboration of it :

" When Turberville" (says he) " was near death, he " sent for Mr. Hewes, the Curate of Saint Martin's, who " was a very worthy man, and from whom I had this account " of him : Turberville looked on himself as a dead man " at the first time he came to him ; but his disease did no " way affect his understanding or his memory : he seemed to " have a real sense of another state, and of the account that " he was to give to God for his past life. Hewes charged him " to examine himself, and if he had sworn falsely against any " man, to confess his sin, and glorify God, though to his own " shame. Turberville, both in discourse, and when he re- " ceived the Sacrament, protested that he had sworn nothing " but the truth, in what he deposed, both against LORD STAF- " FORD and THE EARL OF SHAFESBURY, and renounced the " mercies of God and the benefit of the death of Christ, if he " did not speak the plain and naked truth without any re- " servation, and he continued in the same mind to his death ; " so here" (says BURNET) " were the last words of dying men " against the last words of those that suffered. To this" (he observes) " may well be added, that one who died of sick- " ness, and under a great depression in his spirits, was less " able to stifle his conscience, and resist the impressions that

“ it might then make on him, than a man who suffers on a scaffold, where the strength of the natural spirits is entire; “ or rather exalted by the sense of the cause he suffers for: “ and we know that CONFESSiON AND ABSOLUTION IN THE CHURCH OF ROME, GIVE A QUIET TO WHICH WE DO NOT PRETEND, WHERE THESE THINGS ARE HELD TO BE ONLY MINISTERIAL AND NOT AUTHORITATIVE.” — Burnet’s Own Times, vol. ii. p. 203, Edit. 1724.

What right, then, had MR. DALLAS to assert, that LORD STAFFORD was “ an innocent victim?” If BURNET, whose peculiar opportunities supplied him with the best means of information, felt unable to acquit LORD STAFFORD, in his own judgment; how does it happen, that, at this distance of time, MR. DALLAS feels so much confidence in his innocence, and expects the public to agree with him in opinion, without presenting them with one single fact which may establish that opinion?

With regard to the sentiments which HUME has thought proper to express on the subject of the Popish Plot in the reign of Charles II. it may be observed, that, without entirely adopting DR. JOHNSON’s opinion respecting HUME, namely, that “ upon his own principles he had no motive to speak the truth,” or his other observation, that “ truth did not afford him sufficient food, and therefore he betook himself to error;” it is certain, and has been universally admitted, that HUME’s recapitulation of the evidence adduced on that occasion against the conspirators, is the most partial, slovenly, and garbled statement, which could well have been compiled. With what face could that historian have left on record such a fallacious testimony to the innocence of the Jesuits and Catholics in that affair, when he had before him the body of evidence produced against them on oath, and when he himself admits, that “ the restless and enterprising spirit of the Catholic church, particularly of the Jesuits, is in some degree dangerous to every other communion? Such zeal of proselytism” (says he) “ actuates that sect, that its mis-

“ sionaries have penetrated into every nation of the globe ;
 “ and, in one sense, there is *a popish plot* perpetually carrying
 “ on against all states, Protestant, Pagan, and Mahometan.”
 —Hume’s History, Charles II. Anno 1678.

Is it likely, if the plot had been merely a “ PRETENDED ” one, that **LORD RUSSELL***, that excellent and amiable noble-

* **LORD RUSSELL** is well known to have been himself sacrificed for his attachment to the Protestant religion, and for his opposition to the Duke of York (afterwards James II.) then next in succession. It was he who carried up the Bill from the Commons to the Lords, the object of which was to exclude the Duke from the crown as a Papist, but it was lost in the Upper House. For this decided conduct, and for his observations in his place in the Lower House, the Duke never forgave him, but determined on his ruin; and the infamous **JEFFERIES** (then only King’s Serjeant, but afterwards the Judge and Instrument of James II.) was the most active on his trial. In the paper which **LORD RUSSELL** delivered to the Sheriffs, he says, “ For **POPERY**, I look on it as “ an idolatrous and bloody religion, and therefore thought myself “ bound in my station, to do all I could against it; and by that, I fore- “ saw I should procure such great enemies to myself, and so powerful “ ones” (alluding to **THE DUKE**), “ that I have been now for some time “ expecting the worst ; and blessed be God, I fall by the axe, and not “ by the fiery trial. *I did believe, and do still, that Popery is breaking in* “ *upon this nation, and that those who advance it, will stop at nothing to* “ *carry on their design. I am heartily sorry that so many PROTESTANTS* “ *give their helping hand to it, but I hope God will preserve the Protest-* “ *ant Religion, and this nation, though I am afraid it will fall under very* “ *great trials, and very sharp sufferings.*”—(See this paper at length in the Introduction to **Lady Russell’s Letters.**)—May the prophetical fears of **LORD WILLIAM RUSSELL** be in no way applicable to Protestant England at the present moment ! Rather may the prediction of **LORD RUSSELL’s** colleague, **SIDNEY**, who suffered in the same cause, be realized in her experience : “ God will not suffer this land, where **THE GOSPEL** has of late flourished more than in any part of the world, “ to become a slave of the world. He will not suffer it to be made a “ land of graven images.”

Before this note is concluded, it may be observed, that **RAPIN** gives the following account of the debate in the House of Lords on the Bill for excluding the **DUKE OF YORK** (afterwards **JAMES II.**) from the succession to the Crown : “ The Duke” (says he) “ spoke on the Bill

man, would have lent himself to it, and engaged so actively in its conduct as he is known to have done, or that he would even on the scaffold have “protested that *in the prosecution of the Popish Plot, he had gone on in the sincerity of his heart, and that he never knew of any practice with the witnesses!*”—(Burnet's Own Times, vol. ii. p. 257, Edit. 1724.)—Could such a man have left the following words on record in the paper delivered by him to the Sheriffs, which may be found at length in the Introduction to *Lady Russell's Letters*: “As for the share I had in the prosecution of the Popish Plot, I take God to witness that I proceeded in it, in the sincerity of my heart, *being then really convinced, as I am still, that there was a conspiracy against the King, the Nation, and the Protestant Religion*: and I likewise profess, that I never knew any thing directly or indirectly, of any practices with the witnesses, which I look upon as so horrid a thing, that I never could have endured it; for, thank God, falsehood and cruelty were never in my nature, but always the farthest from it imaginable.”

Is it likely, if the Plot had been only “PRETENDED,” that we should find the following testimony to its reality in BURNET: “About a year before this (1682) TONGUE died (who first brought out OATES). They quarrelled afterwards, and TONGUE came to have a very bad opinion of OATES, upon what reason I know not. He (TONGUE) died with expressions of very high devotion; and he protested to all who

“for excepting himself with tears in his eyes, protesting that *whatever his Religion might be, it should only be a private thing between God and his own soul, and no effect of it should ever appear on the government.*” (Tindal's Rapin, vol. xiv. p. 147, Edit. 1731.)—When this same Duke became King, we have seen how he kept his word: so far from his Religion being “a private thing,” he strove to make it the public Religion of England; and so far from its not affecting “the government,” he would, in a short time, have completely overturned the government of the realm, both in Church and State, had not the nation discovered that Popery in power, and a Protestant Constitution, were things that could not exist together.

“came to see him, that *he knew of no subornation in all that matter, and that he was guilty of none himself.*”—
BURNET'S OWN TIMES, vol. ii. p. 203, EDIT. 1724.

Is it likely, if the Plot had been only “PRETENDED,” that TURBERVILLE, the principal evidence against LORD STAFFORD, would have given his dying testimony to the truth of his own depositions, as we have already seen that BURNET reports him to have done?

It would surely, under these circumstances, have better become MR. DALLAS to have been more cautious in coming to a conclusion, that the Popish Plot in the reign of Charles II. was a fiction; and that LORD STAFFORD was “an innocent ‘victim’ of it: and this hardy assumption on his part, of an hypothesis which rests upon no better foundation, irresistibly reminds us of certain persons mentioned by LOCKE, who “see ‘a little; presume a great deal; and so jump to the conclusion.”

Two reasons rendered it necessary to dwell the more largely on this Plot. First—because the obscurity and ambiguity of MR. DALLAS's quotation from MR. FOX have led many to suppose that MR. FOX's authority was adduced in order to deny the existence of THE POPISH PLOT OF THE 5TH NOVEMBER; and secondly, because MR. FOX's opinion respecting the Plot to which he does advert, is considerably shaken, if not entirely negatived, by the above testimonies, drawn from the period in which the Plot took place.

Before the subject of the Plot in the reign of Charles II. is entirely quitted, it may be observed, in conclusion, that the doubts which have been entertained by some persons respecting the attempt upon the King's life, appear to have been honest doubts; but the Plot comprised another object, namely, the change of the existing government and laws, and the setting up of Popery. Many respectable persons who doubted whether the King's life was ever meant to be taken, felt no doubt whatever upon the other part of the question, while certain difficulties in the large body of evidence which

was brought forward, gave colour to the assertions of many (among whom were all the Catholics, many nominal Protestants, and the friends of both), that the whole Plot, from beginning to end, was a mere fiction invented for the purpose of getting rid of the Jesuits and the Papists. In this number MR. FOX and MR. DALLAS are to be found, who take occasion, from some contradictory testimony which appeared on the part of the prosecution, to conclude, that *no part of the evidence produced on that side* ought to be believed, but that the whole evidence brought forward by the prisoners ought to be believed, although there appeared in it many contradictions not less palpable, and still more difficult to reconcile, than in the other case. Of such reasoners as these, RAPIN gives a striking, though brief, description in the following passage: “These are the improbabilities that have induced many people, “ notwithstanding their persuasion of the reality of the Plot, “ as far as it concerned the government and religion, to sus-“ pend their judgment with relation to the King’s murder: “ the same improbabilities likewise have furnished others with “ a pretence for denying the whole Plot, because they are “ pleased to confine it to this single article; *in which they im-“ pose upon themselves, or are desirous to impose upon their “ readers.*”—TINDAL’S RAPIN, VOL. XIV. P. 235, EDIT. 1731.

MR. DALLAS endeavours (p. 37) to weaken the authority of the STATE TRIALS, not by a direct attack (which would have been too glaring), but by a contemptuous notice of them: unless, however, MR. DALLAS means to contend that these are not authentic records of the trials which they report, and therefore that Lawyers as well as Scholars have been under a great error in referring to them, both as authorities in criminal law, and as valuable in the investigation of history; this indirect mode of casting a shade upon those documents will only share the fate of MR. DALLAS’s more open attacks upon the authentic sources of public information.

In the same page we have an attempt to bring into disrepute the “*ACTIO IN PRODITORES;*” or the Account of the

Trials of the Traitors in the Affair of the Gunpowder Plot, drawn up by the Judges of England; and in order to shew that we ought not to take the words of British Judges, MR. DALLAS informs us, that SIR WILLIAM SCROGGS, the Chief Justice of the King's Bench, behaved with great partiality, and said to the Jury on the verdict of Conviction: " You have " done, Gentlemen, like very good subjects and very good " Christians,—that is to say, like very good Protestants." This statement is taken from HUME; where HE got it, does not appear, for he rarely gives authorities when it would be inconvenient: but RAPIN's account of the conduct of SIR WILLIAM SCROGGS is very different; and on one occasion where he had been blamed, RAPIN expressly defends him.—(See Tindal's Rapin, vol. xiv. p. 189, Edit. 1731.)—RAPIN's account also of the observation made to the Jury is totally different from HUME's; for RAPIN states, that SIR WILLIAM SCROGGS merely said on the verdict, " that they had found the same " verdict that he would have found, if he had been one with " them."—Tindal's Rapin, vol. xiv. p. 191, Edit. 1731.

BURNET also reports, that on the trial of WAKEMAN who was acquitted, SIR WILLIAM SCROGGS was so far from being thought by the Papists to have pressed hard against the prisoner, that the Portuguese Ambassador went publicly on their behalf to thank the Chief Justice the next day for his behaviour on the trial.—(See Burnet's Own Times, vol. ii. p. 155, Edit. 1724.)

If, however, it were to be admitted, that SIR WILLIAM SCROGGS was a disgrace to the Bench, how would this help MR. DALLAS in proving the ACTIO IN PRODITORES unworthy of credit? It was in the year 1678, that SIR WILLIAM SCROGGS incurred the displeasure of HUME and MR. DALLAS by the address to the Jury, which they are pleased to impute to him; but it was in the year 1605, that the Judges of England drew up and published the ACTIO IN PRODITORES. How then can MR. DALLAS connect the conduct of a single Judge, who might have deserved censure, with the credibility of several

other Judges who had published a certain document just seventy-three years before that individual Judge misconducted himself? If, indeed, all these Judges had lived at the same period, MR. DALLAS would have some trouble to shew how the personal folly of one of them could impeach the written testimony of the others. But inasmuch as the supposed offender, SIR WILLIAM SCROGGS, was not actually born at the time when his learned brethren gave their information to the public, MR. DALLAS must excuse us for declining to visit by retrospection the sins of SIR WILLIAM upon his predecessors; in other words, for concluding, that, because one man expresses himself with intemperance at one epoch, therefore that other men who had long before been in their graves, are not to be believed.

MR. DALLAS next relieves his attention, after severer studies, by employing three pages of criticism on the following passage in the *Brief Account of the Jesuits*: “It is fashion-“able with many reasoners to treat all history as a fable, and “to set up for themselves in matters of policy, in defiance of “the testimony of antiquity. These persons would assign “the same office to the records of past ages, as they would to “the stern lights of a vessel, which serve only to throw a light “over the path which has been passed, and not over that “which lies before us.”

MR. DALLAS, after expressly stating, that he is “at a loss “to conjecture what is meant by the allusion to stern lights,” indulges himself, notwithstanding, in several facetious conjectures, on the meaning of the passage, and runs into some reasoning (in which he will not be contradicted), upon the difference between stern lights, and “the moons of carriages.”

Such an attempt to evade the force of a very simple passage by involving it in obscurity, does not appear to require any particular comment: it may, however, be observed, that there is no defect of vision so difficult to treat as that which is the result of a man’s own choice; in plainer (although in homely) terms, “none are so blind as those who will not see.”

If, in the utmost exercise of charity, it were possible to believe, that MR. DALLAS could really mistake or misunderstand the meaning of the above passage, nothing indeed would be easier than to put it in different language; but it is to be feared, that unless the charge which the passage contains against those who reject or impeach the evidence of history, could be at the same time withdrawn, it is not a simple alteration in the phraseology which would satisfy MR. DALLAS, whose quarrel, it may be suspected, is not so much with a mere metaphor, as with the offensive truth which it conceals.

In p. 45, we have another complaint, that, "under cover of "attacking the Jesuits, an attack is aimed at CATHOLICS IN "GENERAL;" and we are frequently reminded by MR. DALLAS, that the opponents of the Jesuits are the enemies of THE CATHOLIC CLAIMS.

In reply to this, it may be right to observe in all frankness, that the two questions of THE JESUITS and the CATHOLIC CLAIMS certainly do appear to be virtually connected with each other; and that while he who defends the Jesuits, or feels indifferent about them, may be excused for advocating the Catholic claims, or preserving silence respecting them, it is almost impossible for any man, who is convinced that Jesuitism is dangerous to the nation, to imagine that the demands which are at present made by the Catholics can be acceded to, without certain injury and destruction to the Constitution of England.

With regard to the Catholic claims themselves, a part of MR. BARON MASERES's preface to his recent edition of *Sir John Temple's History of the Irish Rebellion*, conveys the sentiments of many Protestants upon that grave and momentous subject. "The Petition" (says he) "of the Roman Catholics, or Papists, of Great Britain and Ireland, to Parliament, for what they call *Catholic Emancipation*, is a subject of such great importance to the safety of the present happy constitution of our government, both in Church and State, ever since the final settlement of it, by the glorious

“ Revolution, in the year 1688, that it ought to be examined
“ and considered, with the greatest degree of care and atten-
“ tion, by the Members of both Houses of Parliament, *and*
“ *even by the Electors of the Members of the House of Com-*
“ *mons*, before it is complied with. And, upon this occasion,
“ it seems highly expedient, that they should look back on
“ the various events in our own history, relating to the Pro-
“ testant Religion in England, ever since the permanent es-
“ tablishment of it by Queen Elizabeth, which have manifested
“ the continued and incurable spirit of hostility which the Ro-
“ man Catholics, or Papists, both of England and Ireland,
“ have always entertained against the government of England,
“ when administered by Protestant Sovereigns. During the
“ reign of Queen Elizabeth herself, the Papists, by the in-
“ stigation of their Priests (who were directed by the Pope,
“ and acted in obedience to his spiritual authority), made re-
“ peated attempts to assassinate that great Princess; and the
“ Pope himself excommunicated her, and published a Bull
“ against her, in which he absolved her subjects from their
“ allegiance to her, and exhorted them to expel her from the
“ throne.”

“ And in the next reign, that of King James I. the Papists
“ entered into a most horrid conspiracy to destroy the whole le-
“ gislative body of the English nation at one stroke, by blow-
“ ing up the King, the Lords, and the Commons of Eng-
“ land, when assembled together in Parliament, by the sud-
“ den explosion of thirty-six barrels of gunpowder, which
“ they had secretly conveyed under the Parliament-house, for
“ that purpose; which conspiracy was very near taking effect;
“ and the dreadful mischief, intended to be done by it, was
“ prevented only by a most fortunate discovery, that was
“ made of it, a few days before it was to have been carried
“ into execution. And in the following reign of King
“ Charles I. after Ireland had been reduced to a state of
“ peace and obedience to the authority of the crown of Eng-

“ land, by the suppression of two successive, very formidable
“ rebellions, by the victorious arms of Queen Elizabeth ; in
“ consequence of those successes, a numerous colony of Pro-
“ testants from Scotland had, in the first part of King James’s
“ reign, received grants of land from the King, in the pro-
“ vince of Ulster, in Ireland (which is the northern province
“ of that island, and the nearest to Scotland) ; and had set-
“ tled themselves on the said lands, and cultivated them with
“ great industry and success ; in like manner, many Protest-
“ ants from England had, about the same time, gone to dif-
“ ferent parts of Ireland ; and settled themselves upon several
“ tracts of land which they obtained there, and had, like the
“ aforesaid Scottish colonists, cultivated the said lands with
“ industry and success. Both these sets of colonists had, by
“ their success in the cultivation of their respective tracts of
“ land in Ireland, during a space of more than thirty years,
“ greatly increased the riches and civilization of that country,
“ and had, during all the said time, lived upon terms of friend-
“ ship and familiarity with the native Irish in their several
“ neighbourhoods (who were, for the most part, Roman Ca-
“ tholics, or Papists), and had intermarried with them, and
“ let lands to them upon leases, and taken leases of land from
“ them, and had done, and exchanged, all sorts of offices of
“ good neighbourhood with them ; yet after all this peaceable
“ and happy intercourse between these Scottish and English
“ Protestant colonists, and their Popish neighbours, for so
“ many years, the Popish inhabitants of Ireland paid such an
“ implicit obedience to the wicked suggestions of their Priests,
“ as to enter into a general conspiracy, that extended over al-
“ most all the island, to massacre, on a certain appointed day,
“ namely, the 23d day of October, in the year 1641, all
“ their Protestant neighbours, both Scotch and English, with-
“ out sparing even women and children. And this most abo-
“ minable resolution they did in a great degree execute on the
“ appointed day, and for many weeks, and even months, af-

“ terwards, till the Parliament of England sent an army to resist them *.”

“ Such have been the dreadful consequences that have resulted to the Protestants of England and Ireland in those three reigns, of Queen Elizabeth, King James I. and King Charles I. from the admission of the Spiritual Authority of the Pope; the renunciation of which, the present Petitioners for Catholic Emancipation do, nevertheless, not think it proper that the Government should any longer require from persons holding offices of Power and Magistracy in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

“ It appears from Sir Richard Musgrave’s ample and faithful History of the late Rebellion in Ireland, in the year 1798, that the sentiments of the great body of the common people of Ireland, who profess the Roman Catholic Religion, and of the Romish Priests by whom they are impli-

* It is remarkable, that when the Rebellion of 1641 broke out in Ireland, the Roman Catholics of that country enjoyed all the political power which they now seek in what they term Catholic Emancipation. They were Members of Parliament, Lord Mayors, High Sheriffs, Justices of the Peace, &c. ; yet this did not prevent, but forwarded the Rebellion, and enabled them to accomplish their object of a Protestant persecution with so much greater facility. Those who more particularly enjoyed these privileges were among the foremost to rebel, for several Members of the then House of Commons were actually the ringleaders of the Popish murderers. This is the best answer to the arguments of those who contend that the reason why so much discontent prevails among the Catholics is, that they are deprived of those privileges which their fellow-subjects enjoy ; and that, if the restrictions were taken off, they would rebel no longer. The experiment of emancipation has been tried already, and what were its results ? If the Catholic Religion is unchanged and unchangeable, what will now be the result of the same experiment ? The Irish Catholics now grant and take Leases, as the Protestants : they intermarry : they carry arms : are magistrates : elect members : hold various situations in the revenue department : enjoy the free exercise of their religion : build Chapels where they please : and employ schoolmasters without a license from the Diocesan or Quarter Sessions.

" city directed, continue still as hostile to their Protestant
" fellow-subjects (whom they call Heretics) as they were at
" the time of the detestable massacre of them in the year
" 1641. And surely, if this be the case, it ought not to be
" considered as a breach of the principles of Toleration and
" religious Liberty (as many persons have lately called it),
" but as a mere necessary act of common prudence, dictated
" by the principles of self-defence, to refuse to admit Roman
" Catholics to offices of Magistracy and Power in the State,
" without taking the same oath of Abjuration of the Spi-
" ritual or Ecclesiastical authority of the Pope, which is re-
" quired of all the other subjects of the Crown (whether
" members of the Church of England, or Presbyterians, or
" Independents, or Anabaptists, or Quakers, or Jews, Turks,
" or Infidels) before they are admitted to the same Offices.
" I therefore hope the attentive perusal of the Historical
" pieces here reprinted which set forth, so fully, the horrid
" events that have resulted from the belief entertained by the
" Papists, both of England and Ireland, of the Spiritual
" Authority of the Pope, will prevent all the true friends
" of the present wise and happy settlement of the Govern-
" ment of this Nation, both in Church and State (which was
" made by the Bill of Rights at the glorious Revolution in
" the year 1688, and was confirmed by the subsequent Act of
" Parliament, passed in the latter part of the reign of the
" great King William, for calling the Princess Sophia, Duchess
" dowager of Hanover, and her descendants, *being Protest-*
" *ants, to the succession to the Crown of these Kingdoms*)
" from *weakly giving their consent to so injudicious and dan-*
" *gerous a measure.*"

In a note to p. 45, MR. DALLAS steps aside from his Defence of the Jesuits to defend THE CATHOLIC PRIESTS IN IRELAND; this is however perfectly consistent with his main object. It is impossible that any man who holds up the Jesuits to universal esteem and admiration, can think ill of the Catholic Priests in Ireland.

It had been stated in the “ Brief Account of the Jesuits,” “ that great venality and corruption of morals prevailed in the Catholic Priesthood of Ireland”—Now, how does MR. DALLAS attempt to confute this? By referring to a favourable character of that body given by a Popish Bishop (Dr. MILNER): and does MR. DALLAS really believe that the good character given by that Prelate of his own Clergy, will serve to refute the voluminous and incontrovertible proofs of sedition and rebellion, of bigotry and intolerance, which every man in any degree conversant with the modern history of the Catholic Priesthood in Ireland is acquainted with? But MR. DALLAS calls for these proofs; a volume must be written if they are to be detailed. A few, therefore, must suffice as a specimen.

First, with respect to their *Sedition* and *Rebellion*:

The following particulars, from Sir Richard Musgrave’s History of the Irish Rebellion in the year 1798, will shew the part taken by the Catholic Priests in that Rebellion. Quigley, a Priest, displayed the greatest activity in preparing the way for this revolt by joining “ THE DEFENDERS” (as they were called), who began it, and which body he organized; he passed frequently over to France for his purposes, and was a United Irishman. He was afterwards hanged at Maidstone.

Sir Richard Musgrave further states, that the Popish Clergy (many of whom have been bred in France) never fail to inspire their flocks with admiration of the French nation, and with the most inveterate hatred towards the English, whom they brand with the odious appellation of Heretics.

The same Writer, in the account which he gives of the dreadful Massacre at Scullabogue, in June, 1798, when the Rebels destroyed a great multitude of Protestants, by enclosing them in a Barn, and then setting fire to it, expressly states that the Rebels did not begin to act in that affair, until they received regular orders from a Priest named Bryan Murphy of Taghmon; and he confirms this statement by Affidavits. The whole account of the Massacre at Scullabogue, as given at large in Sir Richard Musgrave’s History, is perhaps

one of the most horrid on record—199 Protestants perished there by the fire, or by being shot at the door of the Barn. See the Affidavits of William Fleming, Catherine Poer, Frances Miller, Elizabeth Dobbyn, Michael Askins, and Robert Mills. Catherine Poer, and Frances Miller, both whose husbands were massacred at Scullabogue, were compelled to be christened by the Priests, in order to save their own lives. The Husband and three Sons of Elizabeth Dobbyn were burnt in the Barn; the Rebels broke her collar-bone, and cruelly used her mother, who was upwards of eighty years old. All the above Affidavits shew the Rebellion to have been founded on an abhorrence of Protestants, and a thirst for their blood.

Shaillow, the Parish Priest of the union of Adamstown and Newbawn, was sworn by David Neville to have been active in promoting the Rebellion in Carrickbyrne Camp [see Neville's Affidavit for much valuable information]. Shaillow liberated from the Barn at Scullabogue, and saved by his clerical authority, a young man of the name of Lett. Bryan Murphy, the Priest, saved the life of William Fleming, by furnishing him with a regular pass. Roche the Catholic Priest, Commander in Chief of the Rebel Camp at Shievekelta, publicly exhorted the Rebels, in the hearing of Fleming (who made Affidavit of the fact), assuring them, that "they were fighting for their religion, their liberty, and "the rights of their ancestors, and that they must persevere;" and Sermons of the same tenour were daily preached by Priests at the head of the rebel columns in their camps. Roche also headed the Rebels in conjunction with Bagenal Harvey at Three Rock Camp, near Wexford; and in a public harangue at Carrickbyrne, he denounced all Protestants as Heretics, in the hearing of a Protestant Gentleman, who was taken prisoner, and afterwards related it to Sir Richard Musgrave, with this additional information, that Bagenal Harvey, the Rebel Chief, who heard the harangue, lamented to him that the war turned out to be purely religious, and that the Priests had got absolute sway. This deluded Chief, Bagenal

Harvey, was a man of honour and humanity, though abandoned to absurd political speculations: he was filled with horror on hearing of the massacre at Scullabogue, and the day after, issued General Orders denouncing the punishment of death on all who should murder their Prisoners; for which praiseworthy act he was deposed, and *Roche the Priest was elected in his stead, as more suited to carry into effect the sanguinary objects of his employers.*

Kearnes the Catholic Priest was a Chieftain of the Rebels at Enniscorthy. He, with others, took prisoners Dr. Hill and his Brother, and kept them as hostages; and in the course of the march, said Mass for his brother Rebels, having a broad-cross belt, and a dragoon's sabre, under his vestment; and when Mass was over, he publicly exhorted the Rebels, but his drunkenness and ignorance prevented his proceeding to any great length.

When Roche the Priest, the Commander in Chief, was encamped on Lacken Hill, he wrote the following Letter to Doyle, another Priest :

“ Rev. Sir,

“ You are hereby ordered, in conjunction
“ with Edmund Walsh, to order all your Parishioners to the
“ camp on Lacken Hill, under pain of the most severe
“ punishment; for I declare to you and to them, in the name
“ of the people, if you do not, that I will censure all Sutton's
“ parish with fire and sword. Come to see me this day.

“ Lacken Hill, June 14th.

ROCHE.

“ To the Rev. James Doyle.”

Andrew Sheppard, a Corporal in the Irish Artillery, swore, that while a prisoner at Wexford, he was taken out into a small square in the gaol to be shot, and on his being placed against a wall in the square, the Rebels burned priming four times at him with a musket: on which the Catholic Priest John Murphy (who had entered the gaol) cried out, “ Let the ‘ Heathen go back to prison, and be damned:”—that on the

morning of the day that the Rebels marched from the camp of Gorey to attack the Town of Arklow, Murphy the Priest, who was killed at the battle of Arklow that day, ascended a car, and preached a Sermon of exhortation to the Rebels, in which he assured them that they were fighting in the cause of God; that the more of the Heathens (meaning the King's Army) they should kill, the sooner they would go to heaven; and that if any of them died in battle, they would be sure of immediate salvation: that the same Priest took some bullets out of his pockets, shewed them to the Rebels, and assured them that they had hit him at the battle of Gorey, in different parts of his body and limbs, and that they could not do him any injury: that he said further in the same Sermon, that he would take the gravel off the road, and throw it at the Heretics, and that he could kill them with it. This witness further deposed, that another Priest of the name of Dixon declared to the Rebel General Roche, that they should take the Town of Arklow in half an hour; that then they should be joined by twenty thousand men; and would then proceed to Wicklow, and from thence to Dublin. He further deposed, that the Rebels, wherever they marched, put to death such Protestants as fell into their hands; saying often on such occasions, that the kingdom was their own, and that there should be but one Religion: that the Rebels, on their arrival at Gorey, after the battle of Arklow, put many Protestants to death, though they had served with the Rebels in that battle, and that when they were on the point of executing one Walker a blacksmith, some of the Rebels pleaded in his favor, saying that he had made many Pikes, and fought well with them; but the Priest John Murphy said "that if there was but one drop of Protestant blood in a family, they ought to put that family to death;" and that the said Walker was accordingly put to death.—See Shepherd's Affidavit, which was sworn before the Lord Mayor of Dublin, on the 7th of September, 1798, and to whose veracity and credibility a Lieutenant General, a Major Gene-

ral, a Major, and three Lieutenant Colonels, all certify by signing their names at the foot of the Affidavit.

George Taylor, of Ballywalter, deposed, that Michael Murphy, another Priest, attended the Rebel Camp at Gorey; and his Affidavit may be consulted for much valuable information respecting the atrocities committed by the Rebels on the Protestants at Wexford and elsewhere.

Bleakney Ormsby, of Garrane, in the County of Wexford, deposed, that the same Priest Michael Murphy, who was chief in command on the march from Gorey to Arklow, halted very frequently on the road, and offered up public prayers for the success of the Rebels, who on those occasions knelt down, and often kissed the ground; and his Affidavit supplies further information on the nature of the contest, and shews that it had every character of a religious war. This witness's father and two brothers were murdered, and another brother died of grief.

Sir Richard Musgrave observes, that the Rebels were supplied with lists of the Protestant Inhabitants of every Parish; and mentions one instance, in particular, of a Rebel, who, on being solicited to save a boy's life, declared that "he could not "release him consistently with his own safety:" which shewed (says Sir Richard Musgrave) "that he acted by the orders "of his superiors."

Richard Grandy, of Ballyshan, in the County of Wexford, deposed, that he obtained a pass from Edward Murphy the parish Priest of Bannow, to pass and repass through his district for the purpose of curing the wounded; and that he attended mass celebrated by him, after which he heard him preach a Sermon, in which he said, "Brethren, you see you are "victorious every where—that the balls of the Heretics fly "about you without hurting you—that few of you have fallen, "whilst thousands of Heretics are dead, and that the few of "you that have fallen was from deviating from our cause, and "want of faith—that this visibly is the work of God, who "now is determined that the Heretics, who have reigned up-

“wards of an hundred years, should be extirpated, and the
 “true Catholic religion be established”—and that this Ser-
 mon was preached after the battle of Ross, and that he heard
 several Sermons preached by the Priests to the same effect;
 and that he likewise heard many Rebels who had been at the
 battle of Enniscorthy and elsewhere, declare, that Roche the
 Priest, a Rebel General, constantly caught the bullets that
 came from His Majesty’s arms, and gave them to his men to
 load their pieces with: that every Protestant that was ad-
 mitted into the Rebel corps, was first baptized by a Priest; and
 that every Protestant that refused to be baptized was put to
 death; and that many, to save their lives, suffered themselves
 to be baptized.

Sir Richard Musgrave also gives a copy of the horrid Oath which was taken by all the Rebels, printed copies of which were found upon numbers who were slain, particularly at the battles of New Ross and Ballicanew, and which oath is as follows: “I A. B. do solemnly swear by our Lord Jesus Christ, who suffered for us on the Cross, and by the blessed Virgin Mary, that I will burn, destroy, and murder all Heretics, up to my knees in blood. So help me God.”

In further proof that the great object of the Irish Rebellion in 1798, was the destruction of the Protestants, the deposition of William Fleming on oath is very material. This Affidavit opens with the following paragraph, viz. that he was a Yeoman in the Taghmon cavalry, was taken prisoner by the Rebels, at Kilburn near Taghmon aforesaid, on the thirty-first May, 1798, by a man of the name of Brien, who was a captain of Rebels; and that the said Brien asked him whether he would be baptized? On which he replied, that he was baptized before, and that he did not think a second baptism necessary: that Brien asked him, whether he knew that this was a religious war? to which he replied, he did not; on which Brien told him, that no person would be suffered to live but he that was a true Roman Catholic.

David Neville swore an Information, the 2d of July,

1798, before the Rev. John Kennedy, and in presence of General Fawcett, that John Cody, Michael Devereux of Battlestown, John Devereux of Dungulph, and David Walsh of Ballygo, in the county of Wexford, were busy in promoting the Rebellion; and said, that the object of the Rebellion was to murder such Protestants as would not turn to mass.

James Murphy, a Papist, deposed on the 2d June, that the object of the Rebellion was to murder all the Protestants, and to have the Kingdom to themselves.

John Fitzgerald, of Black Hill, deposed the same the 3d July, 1798.

Charles Reilly deposed, 5th July, 1798, that he saw Fathers Byrne and Shaillow, at the camp of Carrickbyrne, active and busy in promoting the Rebellion.

Joseph Kelly, a Protestant, deposed, 5th July, 1798, that he was baptized by Bernard Downes, a Priest, along with many more; as he heard and believed, that every Protestant was to be put to death. He also deposed, that brakes of furze were set on fire by the Rebels, in expectation of finding Protestants hid in them.

Andrew Shepherd, and Patrick Dungannon, of the Royal Irish Artillery, who were taken prisoners at the mountain of Forth, on the thirtieth of May, deposed, that the Rebel Generals Roche, Fitzgerald, and Murphy, informed them, that John Colclough, Esq. of Tintern, in the county of Wexford, was at the head of six hundred Rebels, at Tintern aforesaid, ready to cut-off the retreat of the thirteenth regiment of foot; and that the Priests Dixon, Cavanagh, Murphy, and several other Priests, were very busy and active at the Rebel Camp at Gorey, promoting and forwarding the Rebellion. Dixon endeavoured to persuade the Rebels to march to Dublin, for the purpose of taking it, and that they would be joined by twenty thousand Rebels, in the county of Wicklow.

The Affidavit of Elizabeth Edwards states that her neighbours who were Roman Catholics, informed her that all the Protestants would be put to death on the 10th June, 1798;

in consequence of which, she went to the Catholic Chapel, where she was baptized by one Brae the Priest, who afterwards demanded his fee, which she paid him accordingly.

In further proof of the war being a religious war, James Rowson, of a Parish in the County of Wexford, a farmer, swore, that the Rebel Commander at Gorey shot him in the head, and broke his jaw, and that he was "fully convinced" "that he had no other reason for shooting him, than that he "was a Protestant." He further deposes, that his house, outhouses, furniture, and farming utensils were burnt, and his cattle stolen by the Rebels.

Thomas Cleary was executed the 8th of March, 1800, for the murder of his master, Edward Turner, Esq. on the Bridge at Wexford. Just before his execution, he made the following confession, in presence of Joshua Nunn, Esq. High Sheriff, three magistrates, and many others: That he was guilty of the said murder. On his being asked, Did he not think it a sin to kill his master? he replied, that he often heard the people say, it was not a sin to kill him, and that since the murder of his master, he received absolution from two Priests, Edanus Murphy, of the Parish of Kilrush, in the said county, and Ryan, who had done duty for the Priest Redmond, of the Parish of Ferns. He was also asked, did they order him to do any thing for committing so horrid a crime? He answered, they ordered him to fast from meat, three days in each week for three months, as a penance. And this confession was signed by Joshua Nunn, High Sheriff, and three Magistrates.

Elizabeth Crane, of Wexford, widow, deposed on oath, that just before the dreadful massacre of the Protestant Prisoners, in cold blood, which took place on the Bridge of Wexford, on the 20th June, 1798, she saw Doctor Caulfield the Popish Bishop, and Roche the Priest, together in the street of Wexford, and that the Bishop publicly gave his benediction to a multitude of Rebels (who knelt to receive it) armed with Pikes and other weapons, as they were on their way from the

Gaol, where they had been engaged in the work of death, to the Bridge, where a more awful sacrifice was preparing; and that very shortly after the men who had been so blessed by the Bishop, had gone on to the Bridge, two Rebels armed with Pikes entered her house, who told her "they were then slaug-
" tering on the Bridge; that they would never draw bridle till
" they put them all on a level, and that by that time to-mor-
" row there would be neither buying nor selling in Wexford." We further learn from the Affidavit, that this act of the Bishop was no occasional or ordinary affair, since he was nearly an hour engaged in the benediction, during which time the witness heard the shot by which Matthewson was killed at the Gaol. This Bishop appears to have given a Faculty or Power of Attorney to the Priest Bryan Murphy, who ordered the massacre at Scullabogue, enabling him to forgive sins, which, however, he withdrew about two years after the Rebellion. At all events, this or some other circumstance led to a quarrel between these two worthies at that time, and the Letter which follows may afford a fair specimen of Episcopal authority in Ireland.

" Rev. Bryan Murphy!

" Being well and truly informed, that you have
" impiously and sacrilegiously dared to attempt to administer
" sacraments, without having any faculties so to do, nay, that
" you have had the diabolical audacity to attempt to hear sa-
" cramental confessions, and to give the unfortunate penitents
" absolution, which was absolutely not in your power to give,
" thereby heaping coals on your own head, leaving the un-
" happy sinners in their sins, and, as was your practice, lead-
" ing them to utter perdition, &c. &c. Wherefore, in the ne-
" cessary discharge of our pastoral and indispensable duty,
" and for the safety of the faithful committed to our charge,
" we now again repeat, and hereby declare you absolutely and
" to all intents and purposes deprived of all priestly functions
" whatsoever, except the recital of the divine office, in cano-
" nical hours, and saying one mass daily, and that privately,

“ in your own house only; and we hereby expressly and
 “ strictly forbid and interdict you to celebrate mass elsewhere.
 “ And we further order and peremptorily command you not to
 “ suffer or allow any congregations or assembly of people
 “ to come even to your own house, or to hear your mass there.
 “ Given in Ballaine, March 19th, 1800.

“ James Caulfield.

“ To the Rev. Bryan Murphy *.”

The very interesting narrative of the Landing of the French in Ireland, in the year 1798, written by Dr. Stock the late Bishop of Killala, will confirm the above authentic statements, as to the part taken by the Catholic Priests, against their native country, on every occasion of trial. They have, from that period to the present moment, lost no occasion of inculcating sedition; they openly rejoiced in every success of Buonaparte on the continent, and did not conceal their sorrow on being acquainted with his overthrow, as the final defeat of their own unlawful hopes: they have sought to corrupt the youthful mind by poisoning the springs and fountains of early instruction, placing such elementary books in the hands of Catholic children as are only calculated to instil principles of disloyalty and hatred to the existing order of things; and in particular, a Priest of Cork has very lately written a sort of Political Catechism for the use of Schools, which is unhappily in general circulation throughout Ireland, the great object of which is to shew that the whole Catholic population groans under the severest tyranny, and that resistance to such a government is a duty †. They have been active in the collection of funds, throughout Ireland, contrary to the laws, in aid of their objects; and this has been effected by a species of subordinate taxation on their own people, which, so far from

* See all the above Affidavits at length, with much other valuable information, in SIR RICHARD MUSGRAVE'S History of the Irish Rebellion in 1798.

† This new Catechism is called, “ A Sketch of Irish History, compiled by way of Question and Answer.”

being recognised by the Constitution, is in direct opposition to it: they have very recently appealed to the Pope against their own Government and Laws, and sent a formal Deputation from their own country to Rome, to induce the same Pontiff who has revived the Inquisition, and restored the Order of Jesuits, to interpose in their behalf, as an oppressed and persecuted race, and besought him to rid them of their grievances, by asserting their right to complete Emancipation; which is, in other words, a right to exercise complete power, both ecclesiastical and civil, over their Protestant fellow-subjects*. It is unnecessary to proceed further on this head.

There is no man, in any degree acquainted with the present state of Ireland, who is at the same time ignorant of the factious and turbulent spirit of the Catholic Priesthood, and their unwearied efforts to embroil and ruin their unhappy country. In a word, to use the eloquent language of Mr. Bushe, the Solicitor General, in his address on opening the late Special Commission at Clonmel, "Every opportunity has "been seized to keep alive the flame of discontent, and up- "hold the licentiousness of the people: for this purpose, "Missionaries have visited them, and seditious magazines and "other libellous publications have been circulated among "them almost gratuitously, as if it were to pervert one of the "first of human blessings, by making whatever education "they enjoyed instrumental in the corruption of their prin- "ciples. In these poisonous writings, their fellow-subjects are "held up to hatred, their superiors denounced for assassina- "tion, the laws of their country are defamed, justice slan- "dered, loyalty derided, rebellion applauded, and the Ruler "of the French nation proclaimed as their ally, and upheld "as the champion and deliverer of Ireland."

* See an able Pamphlet recently published by Dr. Thorpe, of Dublin, entitled, "*An Examination of the Address of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, to Pope Pius VII. with Remarks on other Documents connected with the Subject of Catholic Emancipation.*"

Mr. Bushe is at once one of the ablest Lawyers, and one of the most enlightened and dispassionate men in Ireland.

In the second place, with respect to the *Bigotry* and *Intolerance* of the Priesthood; specimens of these shall be extracted from the Correspondence recently published by the Society in London, called "the Protestant Union," of which the late GRANVILLE SHARP was Chairman till his death, and for the authenticity of which Letters, that Society has expressly pledged itself to the Public.

In a Letter from Kilkenny it is observed, "From much experience and observation, I am convinced that the Romish Clergy have neither renounced nor relaxed any of the exceptionable doctrines of their Church, but, on the contrary, their *Bigotry* appears to be increasing every day. I am convinced that the Roman Catholics are neither candid nor liberal in their temper and spirit towards Protestants; but, on the contrary, they regard them as Heretics, and out of the pale of salvation. This opinion of theirs was, I believe, at no period more firmly held, than at this moment; indeed, it appears to be completely interwoven with their entire system of *religious instruction*. The interests of the Church are with them paramount to every other; and whilst there is such a bond of union, as at present exists between the Clergy and Laity, and whilst the Pope is acknowledged by both, as Christ's Vicar on earth, it would appear to be the height of infatuation to give power to a people who never loved any but themselves. The advocates for Emancipation appear to view the question in the abstract, without taking into account the spirit and principles of Popery: if these ceased to exist, Emancipation might be granted at once; but unless Popery has changed its nature, it must be the enemy of liberty, civil and religious, and therefore subversive of the happiness of man. And that it has not changed its nature, Ireland is a sad evidence.

" There are two well-known circumstances which evince the nature of priestly influence and bigotry. During the

“ Cork election, in both city and county, some Priests threatened to deny the consolations of religion in their dying moments to any Popish electors, who should vote for the Protestant candidate. And it is not more than a fortnight since a Priest went into an Infirmary in Cork, found a poor patient reading the New Testament, which he violently snatched out of his hand, thrust into the fire, and crushed his heel on it, to bury it more effectually in the flames.

“ As to Securities, what could they give? And, if they had any to offer, I believe it would not be consistent with their creed. Indeed, I cannot conceive it to be consistent with the creed of any honest man to bind himself not to advance what he conceives to be the true religion in every possible manner. Intolerance is of the very essence of the Roman Catholic religion; in relaxing which, they virtually, though not nominally, become Protestants. Popish ascendancy is what every lover of the truth (I think) ought to deprecate. It is not on account of the Papists sharing our privileges, that I am of this opinion; but loving, as I do, the free circulation of the word of God, the unshackled exercise of private judgment in religion, and the unobstructed public opportunities of acting upon these principles, I cannot but tremble, (not, indeed, for the ark itself, but for the peace and comfort of those who bear it, or are hereafter to bear it.)

In another Letter from the County of Limerick is the following passage: “ I can assure you, the Priests' influence over their flocks is much greater than Protestants are in general aware of; and so far have they carried it, that not long since, a servant quitted my house, the day after we hired her, for being asked up to family prayers, declaring the Priest would punish her in the severest manner, if she dared to kneel down with Heretics. And many, who have been by the beds of the sick, where I lately lived in the country, for daring to remain in the house whilst a Protestant

“ ant was at prayer by the bed-side of the sick person, were
“ sent to the Bishop, eleven or twelve miles distant, in very
“ severe weather, to be punished by him for so heinous an
“ offence against their Church. And I can also assure you,
“ that in a school, which I established in the country for the
“ instruction of sixty poor children in reading, writing, and
“ arithmetic, providing them with books and paper, the Priest,
“ *because the Testament was read in the School*, made the
“ parents of all the Popish children in his parish, about thirty
“ in number, to remove them all from the school; and though
“ the inducement was to them great, which they frankly ac-
“ knowledged, yet they sacrificed all to the Priest’s request.”

In a Letter from the County of Tipperary we read as follows: “ The Roman Catholics of Ireland have not, so far
“ as I can see or learn, renounced or relaxed any one except-
“ ionable article or tenet of their Church; but seem to be,
“ if it were possible, more firmly rooted in them. The doc-
“ trine of ‘exclusive salvation,’ they openly and strenuously
“ avow. One of them declared to myself, in the most serious
“ and confident manner, ‘ If you die as righteous as the saints
“ in heaven, you *must* go to hell, unless you die a Roman
“ Catholic.’ And this is their common sentiment. They
“ hold the Pope to be the immediate successor of St. Peter;
“ and say he has the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and
“ that he can admit and exclude whom he pleases. His poli-
“ tical degradation does not, in the least degree, lessen his
“ spiritual power; for, in their estimation, they are quite dis-
“ tinct and independent. The Pope delegates his power to
“ the Bishops, or such a proportion of it as is necessary, and
“ through them it descends to the Priests, who are held here
“ in the most profound veneration by the common people.
“ They say he (the Priest) can work miracles. I knew a per-
“ son, who said once to a Roman Catholic young woman in the
“ County of Limerick, after she had declared all she believed
“ the Priest could do, and hoped he would do for her, ‘ Why,

" woman, you make a *God* of your Priest.' ' Yes,' replied
" she, ' *he is as God to us* *.'

" The Roman Catholics here believe that the Popish
" Clergy *only* have the right of celebrating the ordinance, or,
" as they call it, ' the sacrament of marriage.' Therefore, when
" a Papist and a Protestant happen to be married together by
" a Protestant Clergyman, they uniformly get them married
" over again by their own Clergy. As the Romish Clergy
" claim the exclusive privilege of solemnizing the ordinance of
" marriage, so do they, at least some of them, the power to
" divorce; a power which appears a great evil in the state for
" any body of people to assume in opposition to the laws.
" Father —, the parish Priest of —, I was credibly in-
" formed there, last year divorced several couples, during
" the seven weeks of last Lent, and made it a deadly crime
" for them to speak together during that period, because they
" had married within the Roman Catholic prescribed limits
" of consanguinity; and the poor people say, that ' by that
" time the blood was divorced,' or the original relationship;
" and then he married them again. The Roman Catholic
" Clergy have a great objection to their people reading the

* The account given by the historian DE THOU of the confession of RAVAILLAC, the Murderer of HENRY IV. agrees remarkably with this Female's declaration. RAVAILLAC affirmed (says DE THOU), on his examination, that he had done that act, because the King did not take arms against the Hugonots, and that the King's making war against the Pope, was the same as to make war against God, *seeing that the Pope was God, and God was the Pope*.—And it also corresponds with the Confession of Faith, found in the box of a Priest at Gorey, a copy of which is given by SIR RICHARD MUSGRAVE, in his History of the late Irish Rebellion, in which the Pope is twice blasphemously called " Christ's Vicar, THE LORD GOD THE POPE;" and once " The Holy Father THE LORD GOD THE POPE;" and in which confession it is expressly declared that " the Pope, together with the Primates, Bishops, " Monks, Friars, and Priests, *can make vice virtue, and virtue vice, according to their pleasure!*" an opinion, by the way, which CARDINAL BELLARMINE the Jesuit resolutely maintains.

“ Scriptures. — of — declared that the Priest refused to hear her confession, and to give her the Sacrament, for no other crime than reading the Bible. The same penalty was inflicted on Mrs. —’s servant-maid in the town of —, for carrying her infant child into the Protestant Church to be baptized.

“ I was among the number of those who felt no objection to Catholic Emancipation, as I understood it, supposing they might with safety stand on an equal political footing with the Protestants, as the weight of landed property is in the hands of Protestants, and the appointment to all the high offices of state in the hands of Government; and that their Emancipation would cut off their pretext for dissatisfaction and rebellion. But, from all I have lately seen and heard of their spirit and conduct, my mind is completely changed; and I cannot help thinking their unqualified Emancipation one of the most dreadful evils which could befall the Protestants of this country. I am *forced* to think so, from the very nature of the spirit and principles of their profession. Their religion is, indeed, a dreadful one, when vested with political power. O! remember the blood she has shed, the chains she has forged, the cruelties she has inflicted, and the anathemas she has denounced. And we here in Ireland, who know nothing of the scenes of old exhibited in Smithfield, in the reign of Queen Mary, or the massacre of Paris, in the reign of Charles IX. cannot forget the immolation of the Protestants in the Church of Gorey, the Protestant massacre on Vinegar Hill, the still more dreadful slaughter on the bridge of Wexford, and the *fiery* execution of many scores both young and old, male and female, who perished together in the barn of Scullabogue, no later than 1798: and, alas! her spirit is not at all changed for the better. Have we not then just cause to fear?”

In another Letter it is observed, “ Mr. — of —, who was a Roman Catholic of great respectability, died lately, and during his illness would not see a Priest; declaring

“ that his absolution could do no good if it were not the will
“ of God to shew him mercy; and that if he received that mercy,
“ he wanted not the absolution. The consequence was, that
“ the funeral of that man, which, under other circumstances,
“ would have been attended by a thousand people, was scarcely
“ attended by as many as were necessary to convey his remains
“ to the grave. This fact I had from a respectable clergy-
“ man who was a relative. About two years ago it was neces-
“ sary to appoint a Roman Catholic chaplain to the county
“ prison of Kilkenny; and the Grand Jury selected a man of
“ learning and liberality: but he did not belong to the parish
“ in which the prison is situated, and the late titular Bishop
“ (Doctor Lanigan) put an interdict on him, and would not
“ allow him to officiate. Two most respectable gentlemen of
“ the Grand Jury waited on him. He received them with all
“ the arrogance and hauteur of his priesthood, and declared
“ that the rules of the Catholic Church could not be broken,
“ or its principles violated: they returned much chagrined,
“ but the Doctor persisted in his refusal to sanction their
“ appointment, till at a subsequent assizes he carried his
“ point. The Grand Jury actually rescinded their own
“ order, and appointed the priest of the parish, whom they
“ disliked!

“ Major Bryan, who is now conspicuous among the Roman-
“ ists, once entered the lists with Dr. Lanigan on the subject
“ of the Veto, and even attacked him in the provincial paper:
“ but his bravado was soon over, and he was obliged to suc-
“ cumb, and acknowledge the authority of the Church. Doctor
“ Lanigan had promised to sign for the concession of the
“ Veto; but in consequence of Doctor Milner's influence and
“ instructions, he retracted, and published his celebrated apo-
“ logy, in which he gave five reasons why a promise might be
“ broken: and that, at all events, the promise he made, though
“ a serious, was not a solemn one; and, therefore, according
“ to his maxims, not binding.

“ Heresy is the worst of all crimes, in the estimation of

“ the great mass of people here. Murders, robberies, rapes, &c. &c. are venial in comparison of it. Children are trained up from their earliest years in a fixed and determined hatred to the name of Protestant; and consequently shew that they are influenced by the instructions they receive. In this place, they constantly raise a shout after Clergymen who are active in their parishes, and whom they have been taught to regard as their enemies. The Priests also lay a much heavier penance upon those who perchance hear a sermon at Church, or an exhortation at a grave, than upon those who thieve, fight, &c.

“ When a Funeral passes the street, the multitude will shout aloud in prayer for the deceased person, if he has died a Papist; but if a Protestant, their observation is, ‘ We are sorry we cannot pray for him ! ’ With this people the traditions of men, or, in other words, the will of their Priests, supersedes, in most instances, the commandments of God. Saints’ days are kept with the most scrupulous exactness; but if the preservation of an entire harvest depended upon working on one Lady-Day, they would not do it, whilst, on the other hand, the Sabbath is proverbially profaned and polluted.

“ The spiritual darkness of this fine island is visible, but yet there are some chinks which admit the light. The Bible is beginning to have a free circulation; Sunday Schools are very generally established, and increasing in number and usefulness; tracts have found their way into remote corners; and, from the rapid spread of divine truth, I anticipate great and speedy blessings. The Bible alone can set before them the nature of the true Emancipation; and, indeed, until the souls of the people are emancipated from the grievous thralldom, by which they are held in captivity, and from the unchristian principles by which they are influenced, we neither hope nor expect any good effects from their attainment of political power. By granting what they ask, we should sign our own death-warrant, we should en-

“ tail misery upon our posterity, and prove ourselves utterly
“ unworthy of those great blessings which we enjoy under a
“ free Constitution, and for which our forefathers shed their
“ blood. Oh! for the spirit of a Luther, to enable us to
“ strip off the mask, to expose the deformity of Popery to the
“ world, and to call upon every friend of truth, every lover of
“ the best interests of mankind, to stand firm at this awful,
“ this important crisis! The contest is between truth and
“ error, between liberty and slavery. Let us manfully oppose
“ the principles that are evil, but love and serve those who
“ hold them; those principles which I will not hesitate to say
“ are the curse of Ireland, and the fruitful source of the evils
“ which degrade and debase her.”

In another Letter from the County of Louth are the following remarks: “ You wish to know the present state of the Catholics of Ireland, both Clergy and Laity. It is very easy to prove by stubborn facts, that it is identically the same as it was in 1641, 1690, and in the Irish rebellion of 1798. Five out of the last six years of my life, I have lived in the southern provinces, and have had frequent opportunities of conversing with the Priests and people; some of whom I found to be very worthy characters, but the greater part, bitter enemies both to Church and State.

“ Since I came to this town, another instance serves to shew the spirit of the Catholic Priesthood. In the month of September last, a quarryman was killed by blasting a rock with gunpowder. He was married to a Protestant, and from the time of their marriage, never more went to mass. After his corpse was brought to his house, his friends, who were Roman Catholics, asked liberty of his widow to bring a Priest to say mass for the deceased. She consented, saying that she believed it would do no good. Two Priests immediately came, and after spending a short time in the apartment with the deceased, came to the afflicted widow, and said, ‘ You vile Heretic, you have been the means of damning your husband! He has died out of the pale of

“ the true Church, and cannot be saved.’ One of them in-
“ quired of her, if she was bringing up her children as Pro-
“ testants? She answered in the affirmative. He replied,
“ ‘ So you are bringing up a brood of Vipers for Hell, to go
“ there with yourself.’ This relation I had from the widow,
“ who told it weeping, and it can be attested by many respect-
“ able persons who were present. I might fill many pages
“ with similar accounts.

“ It is well known that the Catholic Priesthood is raised
“ up from among the lowest of the people, and taught in a
“ College, where hostility to the Protestant religion is one of
“ their fundamental principles. And what can you expect
“ from an ignorant people, under the unbounded influence of
“ such men, leaving the Pope out of the question altogether?
“ I do not see, in their present state, what pledge they can give
“ to Government for their future loyalty and good behaviour.
“ An oath of allegiance will not bind, while a Priest can break
“ it, and absolve them; as in many instances they did in the
“ Irish rebellion of 1798.

“ In a Letter from the County of Cork it is observed, “ As
“ to an increase of liberality in religious sentiment, we expect
“ no such thing from Irish Papists. Their doctrine of exclu-
“ sive salvation is their glory, nor will they abate one jot or
“ one tittle of it. That the Irish Popish clergy are as much
“ devoted to, and dependent on, the Pope, as they were three
“ hundred years ago, is an incontrovertible truth; and that
“ they will give no pledge beyond their oath of allegiance,
“ nor make any political accommodations by a Veto, or
“ the nomination of their Bishops, is with them now a fixed
“ point; and indeed, as to concessions, they treat them with
“ contempt, and refuse to make them with a proud abhor-
“ rence. Thus they refuse us salvation; they look on our
“ Ecclesiastical Hierarchy as an heretical usurpation of their
“ rights and dominion: they refuse a political pledge for
“ the allegiance of their superior Clergy, and laugh at all
“ sort of concession to a Protestant government; and yet they

“ insist upon leading our armies, presiding in our courts,
“ and with a Popish population to return themselves to the
“ Imperial Parliament !! Let but a Popish majority possess
“ the elective franchise in towns corporate, as in the counties
“ of Ireland, and let but Papists become eligible to sit in
“ Parliament, and I will venture to prophesy, that in less
“ than seven years, there will not be a Protestant representa-
“ tive from Ireland, in the Imperial Parliament. Alas for
“ the Protestants of this ill-fated country in that day ! Alas
“ for the honour, the rights, yea, the very existence of the
“ Protestant Establishment in our Church in that day ! Who
“ then would not shield the religion of our fathers from the
“ cruel, bigoted, and infuriate spirit of a Priesthood, illiberal
“ from principle, persecuting from habit, and accustomed to
“ exercise a usurped domination over the conscience and judg-
“ ment of the ignorant and superstitious ?

“ With their present hostile views of Protestantism in
“ every form, and their declaration of that hostility ; with the
“ refusal of all concession, accommodations and pledges to a
“ Protestant Government, and at a time when they thanklessly
“ demand, and are determined to extort what they call their
“ rights, from the Government ; I conceive, that to make
“ further advances would betray a bad policy, and a weak and
“ pusillanimous disposition.”

The following is an Extract from the Petition of the Protestant Noblemen, Gentlemen, Clergy, Freeholders, and Inhabitants of the County of Cavan, presented in November, 1812 :

“ We entertain the most cordial affection for our fellow-
“ subjects of the Roman Catholic religion, and heartily re-
“ joice at the repeal of those laws which affected their persons
“ —their property—and the free exercise of their religion.
“ But we beg leave most solemnly to protest against the claim
“ now advanced on their behalf, to be admissible into the
“ offices which constitute the Government, or to seats in the
“ Houses of Parliament ; a claim inconsistent, as we conceive,
“ with the safety of the Established Constitution in Church

" and State, and dangerous to the connexion between Great
" Britain and Ireland.

" We beg leave humbly to represent, that the Roman Ca-
" tholics, in this part of the Empire, are a numerous class,
" forming a strong, distinct, and connected party; under the
" government of a Church, the rival of that which is es-
" tablished by law, retaining at this hour as its head, a claimant
" to all the dignities and possessions of the Church of Ireland,
" holding his title to be little less than of ' Divine Right,'—
" a party, which, from the Reformation to the Revolution,
" maintained a constant struggle for the supremacy in church
" and state.—The wisdom of the great and enlightened cha-
" racters who conducted the Revolution was not able to devise
" any other expedient for effectually securing the existence
" and continuance of a Protestant Church establishment, than
" that of excluding Roman Catholics from the Throne, the
" higher offices of State, and the two Houses of Parliament;
" for they well knew that no such anomaly could ever exist
" together, as a Roman Catholic government and a Protestant
" Church. But, should Parliament be induced to condemn
" this principle, and to admit the Roman Catholics to all the
" higher offices of the state, your Petitioners do not see on what
" principle their admissibility to the Throne can be denied.—
" They demand perfect equality with their Protestant fellow-
" subjects, and boldly state that nothing short of this will
" satisfy them: as long as they are excluded from the Throne,
" and the possessions of the Church, they cannot consider
" themselves on such an equality. We confess we are not
" prepared to sacrifice to their demands the Protestant Consti-
" tution of these realms *."

* See, for many other Letters, and much valuable information on the present state of Catholic Ireland and her Priesthood, the series of Letters and Papers lately published by the PROTESTANT UNION SOCIETY, which are sold at Bickerstaff's, Essex Street, and other Book-sellers. In that work will be also found an able and triumphant answer to MR. BUTLER's pamphlet in favor of " Catholic Emancipation."

The intolerant and exclusive character of Popery in Ireland, and the bigotry and hatred with which a purer system is regarded by its Professors, will appear farther from the constant and inflexible opposition of the Priests to the system of Education, the increase of Sunday Schools, and the diffusion of the Bible ; they resist in the most determined way the introduction of sacred or human Learning, except as connected with their own principles, and they exert their whole influence (which is very extensive) against the dispersion of truth and the light of science in Ireland : a greater crime can hardly be committed in the eyes of a Priest, than that one of his Flock should encourage a Sunday School or a Bible Society ; and their efforts to keep the people in darkness and ignorance, afford the best proof that they dread the influx of knowledge as at war with their whole system, and furnish the strongest argument for increased exertions on the part of our Government, and of all the real friends of Ireland, to enlighten the public mind by educating the mass of the population, which is the best and only antidote of Papal and political abuses, and the most effectual means of overthrowing Idolatry and Superstition, and of weakening the dominion of man over the conscience of his Brother.

Enough perhaps has now been said in proof of the *political crimes* of the Irish Catholic Priests, and also in proof of their *bigotry* and *intolerance* towards Protestants. It would be no difficult task to shew that the state of *personal morality* is at a very low ebb indeed in this body ; and innumerable examples might be adduced, all tending to prove that corruption of practice exists in Ireland to an awful extent, among the Ministers and Teachers of a corrupt religion. To enter into details on such a subject, or to cite particular examples, would be at once invidious and inexpedient. To those who are in any degree acquainted with the interior of Catholic Ireland, little need be said on a subject of this nature, since their whole experience will confirm the assertion which has been made. In the capital of Ireland, indeed, as well as in the cities and larger towns of

the Empire, considerable caution is observed by the Priests in concealing their vices; and it is even possible that a conviction of the necessity of preserving appearances, and avoiding scandal, may in many instances operate to restrain them from the grosser vices, and tend to produce considerable attention to external decency: in those towns and villages, however, which maintain little intercourse with the Metropolis, and have scarcely any connexion with the higher and more respectable classes of Society, the depravity of the Irish Priesthood is deplorable: their licentiousness with reference to the other sex is of the most notorious description; and there can be no doubt that their very religion itself, in a variety of instances, is made subservient to the pursuit of their object, and the furtherance of their purposes. This passage will be perfectly intelligible to those who are familiar with the internal state of Ireland, and with the powerful influence of the Priests over their deluded and benighted flocks; and such persons will be abundantly able to confirm the accusation which it involves: this influence is of such a nature, that there is no punishment to which an illiterate Irish Catholic of either sex would not submit, rather than betray or speak evil of the Priest, whose benediction is considered as the highest advantage which can be enjoyed, and whose curse is more deprecated than any temporal evil. Many of the Priests of Ireland have a female constantly residing with them under the name of *a niece*, which designation is perfectly understood in that country; while others, who choose to avoid the reproach of incontinency at home, make ample amends for the privation by profligacy of a more general description.

DRUNKENNESS may be considered as a vice almost indigenous to the Irish Catholic Priesthood: the instances of the addiction of the Priests to this vice are innumerable; its universality among them has in a measure lessened the horror with which it would otherwise be regarded: many Priests have not only injured their health by their excesses in this particular, but some have actually perished in fits of drunkenness; there

are few of them in the remote parts of the country who are not drinkers of spirits, while many are systematic and habitual drunkards.

The *venality*, *fraud*, and *extortion* of the Irish Priests, are almost proverbial: they direct pilgrimages to be performed by the deluded people, and they assign the particular stations to which they are to proceed; from whence arises a considerable revenue to the Priests, who reside in the vicinity of the places resorted to. The pecuniary profit accruing from Indulgences, and other spiritual articles of traffic, is not more overlooked in Ireland, than in other Popish countries; and it is no uncommon practice with the Priests, after having enjoined some humiliating or vexatious penance to a wealthy member of their own communion, to commute such penance for a heavy pecuniary fine*. In Ireland too, where money is scarce, the Priests are commonly remunerated by their people *in kind*. Presents of various sorts are frequently exacted, where they are not bestowed so liberally as the Priests expect them to be; and instances are constantly occurring in Ireland, where the infliction of penance, and the threats of excommunication, compel the unwilling contributions of the Catholic poor, both in money and other offerings. When spiritual influence has lost its effect, it is no unusual thing for ecclesiastical terrors to supply its place, both on this and other occasions; and the power usurped over the conscience is not the only one, nor often the worst, which the unfortunate Devotee experiences at the hands of his Pastor: such, however, is the force of the religious system by which he is bound, and so great the infatuation with which he is taught to respect the commands of his Priest, that, generally speaking, it would be considered the

* There exists, at this moment, publicly in DUBLIN, a "Purgatorialian Society," the professed object of which is to pray the souls of the Subscribers' Relatives and Friends out of Purgatory, and for which avowed object, considerable sums are collected by the Priests, in weekly subscriptions of a penny and upwards.—See Dr. Thorpe's work, referred to before, p. 132, *Note*.

height of impiety to appeal to the laws of the land, for redress against his spiritual tyranny, since the complainant would thereby expose the character, and violate the authority of one who is, in effect, the Pope of the district over which he presides.

The task of developing the personal delinquencies of the Priesthood is sufficiently painful, or the present article might be considerably extended: the interests of truth, however, appeared to require that thus much should be adduced in reply to BISHOP MILNER's defence of his Clergy; nor can it be considered any violation of the Laws of Charity, that plain facts should be stated in a case where rebellion is so audacious, bigotry so violent, and vice so flagrant, as among the Catholic Priests of the Sister Country.

In p. 47, MR. DALLAS quotes RAPIN for the purpose of proving the cruelty of the Judges in the reign of QUEEN ELIZABETH, and also of further invalidating the evidence furnished by THE STATE TRIALS and the ACTIO IN PRODITORES; but it is a fraudulent Quotation, and a reference to RAPIN will shew, that MR. DALLAS was not justified in presenting that Quotation to his readers in such a mutilated form. He produces no more of what RAPIN says than the following words: " Meanwhile the Queen sent for the Judges of the realm, and sharply reproved them for having been too severe in the tortures they had made these men suffer." Now, this being a very small part of what RAPIN says, and only that part which it suited MR. DALLAS to produce, while all the rest of that author's statement is directly opposed to MR. DALLAS's assertion, let us hear what RAPIN really does say: " Several Books, as well printed as manuscript, were handed about, wherein the Queen was slandered to the highest degree. She was taxed with putting to death many Catholics without cause, having first racked them, in order to compel them to confess crimes whereof they were innocent. Her maids of honour were exhorted to serve her in the same

“manner Judith did Holofernes, and render themselves, by
“such an action, worthy of the applause of the Church,
“throughout all future ages. Meanwhile, the Queen, willing
“to shew *it was not for their religion that some Catholics*
“*had been punished*, sent for the Judges of the realm, and
“sharply reproved them for having been too severe in the
“tortures they had made these men suffer. *In all likelihood,*
“*this was done to afford them an opportunity to clear them-*
“*selves from this charge, by an apology which was made*
“*public: they affirmed ‘that no person had been made to*
“*suffer for his Religion, but only for dangerous practices*
“*against the Queen and State;* that, indeed, CAMPION the
“Jesuit had been put to the rack, but with so little violence,
“that he was presently able to walk and subscribe his confes-
“sion; that BRYAN, one of his accomplices, obstinately refus-
“ing to speak or write, the person's name who penned the
“papers found about him, was, indeed, denied food till such
“time as he asked it in writing.’ But, however, the Queen,
“willing to take from her enemies all occasion of disparaging
“her in foreign parts, forbid the putting any person
“whatever to the rack, and was satisfied with transporting
“out of England seventy Priests who were in prison, and
“of whom some were under sentence of death: among these
“were certain Jesuits, who afterwards proved very ungrate-
“ful for the kindness she did them; perhaps, indeed, she
“acted upon this occasion, not so much from a motive of
“clemency, as to separate two things which *they* studied al-
“ways to confound, namely, Religion, and the crimes against
“the State, under pretence that most of the Conspirators
“were Catholics.”—TINDAL'S RAPIN, Vol. ix. p. 36, Edit.
1729.

Now, if, instead of taking an insulated text from RAPIN, MR. DALLAS had given us the context, we should have seen that Queen Elizabeth did not abstractedly condemn the Judges for persecution, as he would have us think; but that

she complained of them publicly, in order (as Rapin believes) that by their public answer, or apology, her own conduct might appear to have sprung, as it really did, not from any hatred of the Jesuits, or their religion, considered in themselves, but from their “dangerous practices against the Queen and “the State.” The case was, that the Jesuits, as well as the Catholic Priests, had invariably represented the Queen as hostile to their religion, and persecuting them merely on that account; they chose to deny that they had been the authors of their own misfortunes by their previous perverse and rebellious conduct; and they persisted in attributing the opposition they experienced, to the personal hatred of ELIZABETH. Now, in order to the vindication of her own conduct, she called upon the Judges to give an account of theirs, which they immediately did; and this account was made public by the Queen, in order that the world might at once estimate her motives, and those of the Jesuits and Catholics.

In all this, there is nothing which proves the Judges to have been vindictive or severe, as MR. DALLAS would insinuate, but the direct contrary: if, indeed, one paragraph of a statement is to stand for all the rest, then RAPIN may be made to speak any thing, either on this or any other occasion; and, upon this principle, it signifies little what view may have been taken by an ancient Historian who has told the *whole* truth, if a modern writer is to be permitted, by quoting only *a part* of the truth, to draw his own conclusions from such invalid premises.

If it be any question, whether the Jesuits and Priests did or did not provoke opposition by the most perverse and criminal practices through the whole reign of ELIZABETH, let RAPIN be honestly consulted, and fairly quoted, and the fullest conviction of their intrigues and treasons must be the result. It would be endless to follow him through his statements on this point, but a few may not be useless:

After speaking of the English Seminaries at Rome and

Douay, whose main object, he says, was "to send Priests " into England to preach sedition and rebellion," he observes, " As long as the Court imagined these men only administered " the sacraments in private to those of their religion, no no- " tice seemed to be taken of it; but it was discovered at " length, that they were diligent in spreading pernicious prin- " ciples which might be attended with ill consequences. They " maintained, that THE POPE had by divine right full power to " dethrone Kings, and that ELIZABETH being excommunica- " ted and deposed by Pius Vth's Bull, her subjects were " freed from their allegiance: four of these dangerous emis- " saries were condemned and executed, for daring to maintain " publicly that the Queen was lawfully deposed.

" This did not hinder the two Seminaries from continually " sending into England Incendiaries, with whom were joined " ROBERT PARSONS and EDMUND CAMPION, Jesuits, who " were the first of that Order employed to preach the above- " mentioned dangerous tenets. They had obtained of the " Pope a Bull, dated 14th of April, 1580, declaring that " POPE PIUS's Bull bound ELIZABETH and the Heretics al- " ways; but in no way the Catholics, till a favourable oppor- " tunity should offer to put it in execution. These two Je- " suits had professed the Protestant Religion, and even held " places in the University of Oxford: after that, withdrawing " from England, they returned from time to time, appearing " one while like Clergymen, another while like Soldiers, or in " some other disguise, and frequented the Houses of the Ca- " tholics, under pretence of instructing and comforting them; " but in reality to inspire them with sedition and rebellion. " All this coming to the Queen's knowledge, a Proclamation " was issued out, which (among other things) forbid all per- " sons to entertain or harbour any Jesuits or Priests, sent " forth from the Seminaries, upon pain of being punished as " rebels and seditious persons: shortly after, printed books " were dispersed, intimating that the Pope and King of Spain " had formed a design to conquer England and restore the Ca-

“ tholic Religion, and exhorting the English Papists to help forward the design; whereupon the Queen issued out another Proclamation, declaring she was not ignorant of the practices of her enemies, but, by the grace of God, and the help of her faithful subjects, she was able to withstand their attacks both at home and abroad: that, moreover, as the plots which were contriving were not only against her person, but also against the whole kingdom, she did not intend to be cruel to the good by sparing the bad, and, therefore, such as would not for the future keep within the bounds of their duty, were to expect no mercy.”—Tindal’s Rapin, Vol. ix. p. 6, Edit. 1729.

Again, “ England was all of a sudden overrun with Romish Priests, Jesuits, and other Catholics, who hoped to be screened there by THE DUKE OF ANJOU: among these, some were so imprudent as to vent openly the most extravagant doctrines concerning the Pope’s power, a crime then unpardonable, because it tended to deprive the Queen of her Royalty, and stir up her subjects to rebel against her. It is no wonder, therefore, that the furious zeal and imprudence of some of the Catholics drew upon the whole body severities, which the Queen would not have been easily brought to, if they had been contented to sit down in quiet with the free exercise of their religion in private, and not attacked the Government. What did them still a further injury was, that some of them owned they were come into England with power to absolve every one in particular from his oath of allegiance, from which PIUS V.’s Bull had absolved the whole nation in general.”—Ibid. p. 19.

Again, RAPIN, after speaking of one of the Acts of Parliament of that time, observes, “ This was the severest Act against the Catholics in the reign of QUEEN ELIZABETH: but they could blame nobody but themselves, or rather the indiscreet zeal of some amongst them, who never ceased plotting against the Queen, and endeavouring to set the Queen of Scots on the throne of England. Even this Sta-

“ tute was not capable of holding them in, till at last they
 “ carried their zeal to such a height, that the destruction of
 “ one of the Queens became necessary for the preservation of
 “ the other.”—Ibid. p. 48.

And further, after enumerating several dangers which threatened the kingdom in the year 1585, RAPIN observes, “ I mention not the Court of Rome, or the English Catholics, *who always continued in the same mind*, so that there was nothing new in that respect. THE QUEEN OF SCOTS was all along the stumbling-block: it was she that gave birth to all the devices. They had a mind to free her from captivity, in order to set on her head the crown of England and Scotland, and restore by her means the Catholic Religion in the two kingdoms. This was the scheme of ELIZABETH’s enemies. She could not be ignorant of it, since they had pursued it from the very beginning of her reign.”—Ibid. p. 49.

Again RAPIN observes on this point: “ Nothing shews her capacity more than her address in surmounting all the difficulties and troubles created by her enemies, especially when it is considered who these enemies were—persons the most powerful, the most artful, the most subtle, and the least scrupulous in Europe. The bare naming of them is sufficient to convince all the world—THE COURT OF ROME, under several Popes, PHILIP II. King of Spain, the DUKE OF ALVA, HENRY II. and CHARLES IX. Kings of France, CATHERINE OF MEDICIS, the DUKE OF GUISE, CARDINAL LORRAINE, MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS, ALL THE ROMISH CLERGY, AND PARTICULARLY THE JESUITS.”—Ibid. p. 221.

And again: “ She is warmly accused of persecuting the Catholics, and putting several to death. ’T is true, there were some that suffered death in her reign; but one may venture to assert, that *none were punished but for conspiring against the Queen or State, or for attempting to destroy the Protestant Religion in England, and restore the Romish by violent methods.* The Catholics who lived in quiet were tolerated, though with some restraint as to the exercise of

“ their religion, but with none as to their consciences: if this may be called Persecution, what name shall we give to the sufferings of the Protestants in the reign of Mary?”—Ibid. p. 224.

In perfect conformity with this view of Elizabeth's reign, and of the intrigues of the Catholics and Jesuits, is all that SULLY has left on record upon the subject: in one place, in particular, he observes, “ Quelque tems avant la mort d'Elizabeth, les partisans de l'Espagne ayant, comme à l'ordinaire, les Jesuites à leur tête, exciterent des brouilleries dans les trois Royaumes de la Grande Bretagne: la Religion leur servit de pretexte, quoique la Politique en fut le véritable objet.”—Sully's History, Vol. iv. Book 5, p. 357, Edit. 1768.

One more passage only shall be cited from RAPIN: it is in reference to the conduct of Queen Elizabeth in IRELAND: “ The Irish had for the Pope an attachment equal to their ignorance, which was extreme: this disposed them to listen to the solicitations of the Romish Emissaries, who were continually inciting them to rebellion against the Government. Elizabeth, therefore, was continually watchful upon the transactions of that Island, knowing what was the interest and credit which the Pope, her enemy, had there.”—Tindal's Rapin, Vol. viii. p. 260, Edit. 1729.

A note of MR. DALLAS to page 48 requires to be noticed. It is as follows: “ HUME says, CAMPION was put to the rack, and, confessing his guilt, was publicly executed. The confession of guilt is not so clearly proved as the putting to the rack. In the Life of CAMPION, the Confession is denied; and what HUME says himself immediately before, is strong against the imputed guilt, that he and PARSONS were sent to explain the Bull of PIUS, and to teach that the subjects of Elizabeth were not bound by it to rebel against her.”

Now, first, MR. DALLAS suppresses an essential part of HUME's Statement; viz. that the Jesuit CAMPION was “ DETECTED IN TREASONABLE PRACTICES,” and punished ac-

cordingly. And secondly, HUME never states (as MR. DALLAS asserts), that CAMPION and PARSONS were "sent to teach " that the subjects of Elizabeth were not bound by the Pope's " Bull to rebel against her;" but only to teach, that they were not so bound by it as to act before a favorable opportunity should offer, for which they were to wait, and on the arrival of which, they would receive fresh orders from the Pope to carry his Bull into execution.

The whole passage in HUME will shew that the colour given by MR. DALLAS to the affair is not warranted by any thing advanced by that Historian. "The Bull of Pius" (says HUME), "in absolving the subjects from their oath of " allegiance, commanded them to resist the Queen's usurpa- "tion: and many Romanists were apprehensive that by this " clause they were obliged in conscience, *even though no fa- vorable opportunity offered*, to rebel against her, and that " no dangers or difficulties could free them from this indis- " pensable duty. But PARSONS AND CAMPION, two Jesuits, " were sent over with a mitigation and explanation of the doc- " trine; and they taught their disciples, that though the Bull " was for ever binding on Elizabeth and her partisans, *it did not oblige the Catholics to obedience, except when the Sovereign Pontiff should think proper, by a new summons, to require it.*"—Hume's History, Elizabeth, Chap. xli. Anno 1581.

It is thus, by perverting the above statement of HUME, that MR. DALLAS extracts an evidence for the innocence of PARSONS and CAMPION, whom even HUME had given up: from the passage as given by HUME, those Jesuits only taught that the Catholics were not to act until the Pope should be of opinion that they might act with effect: from the statement as given by MR. DALLAS, those Jesuits taught "that the subjects of Elizabeth were not bound to rebel against her" at all, from which he would have us conclude that they were very pacific and amiable people, and consequently very hardly treated!

With regard to "THE LIFE OF CAMPION," having denied his Confession,—there is no fact, however well authenticated, which the Jesuits and their friends will not deny, nor any abomination, however flagrant, which they will not defend, if it may answer their purpose. JOUVENCI, in his "History of the "Jesuits," denies the guilt of GUIGNARD, who was hung for being implicated with CHATEL in the conspiracy against HENRY IV. and defends him as "a martyr for the truth," "a Christian Hero," and "an imitator of the love of Jesus Christ." He calls his Judges "persecutors," and compares the First President HARLAI to "PILATE," and "the Parliament" to "the Jews."—(See *Dictionnaire Historique*, Article JOUVENCI.)

With regard to the quotation from CAMDEN's *Annales Rerum Anglicarum regnante Elizabethâ*, with which we are furnished in p. 49, it is much to be regretted that Mr. DALLAS's love of the Jesuits should have led him in that instance, as in so many others, to an imitation of their usual practice of quoting just so much of a passage as suits their purpose, and omitting the context.

CAMDEN does indeed say, as Mr. DALLAS represents, that the Queen did not think that many of the *Priests* were guilty of meditating the destruction of the country; but this is only one sentence of a passage, the whole of which, taken in connexion, proves the direct contrary to what Mr. DALLAS would wish.

Let us consider the whole passage as it stands in CAMDEN: after having spoken of the capital punishment of the four Superiors of Jesuits, CAMPION, SHERWIN, KIRBY, and BRIANT, and noticed the fact of many others having been condemned to death, only five of whom, however, were executed in ten years, he observes: Undoubtedly the times were of such a nature, that the Queen (*who never designed to apply force to the conscience*) would afterwards lament that she had been driven by necessity to these measures, or that she must otherwise have seen destruction brought upon herself and her sub-

jects, under the alleged pretext of Conscience, and the Catholic Religion. She did not, however, think that many of the miserable *Priests* were guilty of meditating the destruction of the Country, but that THOSE SUPERIORS were the instruments of their crime, since the Priests who had been sent over here had surrendered themselves to the entire disposal of those SUPERIORS; that in the questions which had been put to them respecting the Papal Bull of PIUS V. and the Queen's supremacy, some had answered so ambiguously, and some so violently, while others had evaded inquiry by prevarication or silence, that even some of the more respectable Catholics themselves began to suspect that these men cherished traitorous designs; and one in particular (BISHOP) wrote against them, and against the Council of Lateran, for promulgating the pernicious doctrine of deposing Kings, and absolving subjects from their allegiance. CAMDEN further proceeds to state in the same passage, that suspicion was daily increased by the great number of Priests surreptitiously introduced into England, who secretly practised upon the minds of men; preached that Princes excommunicated were to be deposed—insinuated that those who did not profess the Romish Religion had forfeited all title to royalty; and that persons initiated in sacred things, were free (by their ecclesiastical privileges) from all jurisdiction of Princes, being neither bound by their laws, nor subjected to their authority; that the Pope was Supreme, and had the fullest power over the whole world, even in political affairs, but that the Rulers of England were by no means lawful Rulers, and therefore were not to be so esteemed; that, further, the Declaratory Bull of Pope PIUS V. had rendered whatever had been done by the Queen's authority utterly null and void; nor did some dissemble that they had come into England, with no other object than that they might, under that Bull, absolve the people from every oath of fidelity and obedience towards the Queen, and they promised (says CAMDEN) absolution from every mortal sin, which they were enabled

to do the more securely, because the more secretly, *under the Seal of Confession.*

Such is the whole amount of CAMDEN's testimony in that part of his History from which MR. DALLAS has thought proper to cull a single sentence, which appeared to favor his own views.

Did MR. DALLAS suppose that CAMDEN'S ANNALS had become so scarce, that only his own copy of that work was attainable? or did he imagine that other persons would be content to take his partial statement upon trust without further examination?

The fact is, that a more unfortunate reference could hardly have been made by MR. DALLAS than to CAMDEN; whose exposure of the treasons and intrigues of the Jesuits, throughout the whole reign of ELIZABETH, should have at least taught any apologist of the Jesuits a respectful silence, and prevented him from subpœnaing an author, who, so far from proving his case, has in every instance established the direct contrary.

In proof of CAMDEN'S opinion respecting the crimes of the Jesuits and Priests, MR. DALLAS has only to open his CAMDEN again, and to turn to the following passages among many others (*if he be not already acquainted with them*).

1st. CAMDEN'S account of the employment of ROBERT RIDOLPHUS, by Pope PIUS V. to stir up the Catholic Priests in England, which (says CAMDEN) he did most sedulously and secretly. See Camden's Annals of the year 1568.

2d. CAMDEN'S account of the Continental Seminaries of Jesuits, from which their emissaries were sent to England and Ireland; which occurs in his annals of the year 1580: and also his account of the Jesuits CAMPION and PARSONS, as recorded in the same year.

3d. The behaviour of CAMPION after his condemnation, as related in the annals of the year 1581.

4th. The conduct and confession of PARRY, recorded in the year 1585.

5th. The behaviour of the Jesuits when they saw that all

hope of setting up Popery by means of MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS had failed them, as recorded in the annals of the year 1586.

6th. His account of the trial of THE EARL OF ARUNDEL in the year 1589.

7th. The recital of the behaviour of the Jesuits in Scotland, in the beginning of the year 1592, and the like in 1593, under CRICTON the Jesuit.

8th. The conduct of PARSONS, DOLMAN, CARDINAL ALLEN, CULLEN, HOLT, OWEN, INGLEFELT, WILLIAMS, and others, in the year 1594; with CAMDEN's admirable reflections on the providence of God, in the signal preservation of QUEEN ELIZABETH.

9th. The character of CARDINAL ALLEN, as given by CAMDEN, in his annals of the same year, 1594.

10th. The account given by him of YORK, WILLIAMS, HOLT, OWEN, and others, as occurring in the annals of 1595; where he uses the strongest language, respecting their infamous abuse of Religion and its sacraments to the vilest purposes of regicide and rebellion.

11th. The account of SQUIRE and WALPOLE's conspiracy against the Queen, as related in the annals of 1598.

12th. CAMDEN's recital (in the year 1600) of the Bull of POPE CLEMENT VIII. sent to the Irish Rebels then in arms against QUEEN ELIZABETH; in which the Pope calls the Rebellion "an expedition against Heretics," and declares himself willing to grant the Rebels all possible testimonies of his special grace and favor for having undertaken it!!!

13th. CAMDEN's account (in the same year 1600) of the two Briefs sent by the same Pope to the Clergy and people of England, enjoining them to use all possible exertion to prevent any monarch from ascending the throne after the Queen's death who would not assert and maintain the Catholic religion; which Bulls actually produced an attempt on the life of JAMES I. who was the Protestant Prince then next in succession.

14th. CAMDEN's account of the Quarrel between the Je-

suits and the secular Priests in England, as stated in the annals of the year 1602.

What shall we now think of MR. DALLAS's assertion, p. 113, that, "in regard to Protestant countries, the Jesuits' principles " of loyalty are conclusive in their favor: and in spite of the " Popish plots, it has been proved that their religious doctrines " never led them as a body to interfere in political affairs?" If none of all the above damning proofs against the Jesuits had been put on record by CAMDEN, still the passage cited from him by MR. DALLAS would fall short of proving his point; since the utmost which it proves is, that the Queen did not think all the Catholic Priests guilty *in the same degree with each other*, and that she thought their Leaders, THE SUPERIORS, more guilty than any of them. And how did the Queen act under this conviction? she awarded punishment accordingly: some were merely fined—others were banished; and others were executed: but because she did not consider all these men equally guilty, nor punish them accordingly, MR. DALLAS was not justified in giving us only that part of the History, in which the Queen is declared not to have thought *all* the Priests guilty of *High-treason*, without at the same time producing the powerful evidence brought forward by CAMDEN, to prove that multitudes among them were guilty of that crime.

CAMDEN well knew, that to put a naked assertion in the mouth of the Queen, of the innocence of the greater part of the Jesuits and Priests, would have been as much at war with the whole history of the period in question, as with every part of that Queen's character; and he therefore makes no such attempt.

The Queen declared repeatedly, in the most public and solemn acts of her reign, that the Jesuits and Romish Priests were not merely opposed to her interests, but sought her life. Her Parliament as frequently made the same declaration, and framed many express Statutes for the preservation of the Constitution, and the safety of the Queen. The Judges of the realm, the Juries of the land, the Nobility, the Magis-

trates, and various Public Bodies and Individuals, in all ranks of Society openly declared their conviction of the guilt of the parties in question, some of whom actually confessed it. The most faithful Historians of the period entertain no doubt of their criminality, and furnish the best reasons in support of it; and yet, against all this evidence, we are now expected to believe that the Queen thought most of these men absolutely innocent: if this improbable calumny could be credited, it would affix the deepest stain upon the character of the most patriotic and popular Queen who ever filled a throne; a Queen whose memory is deservedly dear to England in particular, and respected by the world at large, but whose reputation, it seems, is no longer to be regarded if the Jesuits or their adherents may be profited by pulling it down *.

* The beautiful, and at the same time the impartial summary of Queen Elizabeth's reign and policy, by BURNET, will naturally occur in this place to the Reader of English History.

“ In foreign parts (says he) she was the Arbiter of Christendom; and “ at home, things were so happily managed, trade did so flourish, and “ justice was so equally distributed, that she became the wonder of the “ World. She was victorious in all her wars with Spain; and no “ wonder: for it appeared signally in the ruin of the great Armada, “ which Spain looked on as invincible, that Heaven fought for her. She “ reigned more absolutely over the hearts, than the persons of her sub-“ jects. She always followed the true interests of her people, and so “ found her Parliaments always ready to comply with her desires, and “ to grant her Subsidies, as often as she called for them: and as she “ never asked them, but when the occasion for them was visible, so after “ they were granted, if the state of her affairs changed so, that she “ needed them not, she readily discharged them. Rome and Spain set “ many engines on work, both against her Person and Government: “ but she still lived and triumphed. In the first ten years of her reign, “ the Papists were so compliant, that there was no stir made about “ matters of religion. Pope Pius the Fourth condemned the madness “ of his Predecessor, in that high and provoking message which he sent “ her; and therefore he attempted a reconciliation with her at two “ several times, and offered, if she would join herself to the See of “ Rome, that he would annul the Sentence against her mother's mar-“ riage, and confirm the English service, and the communion in both

MR. DALLAS, in p. 53, professes to consider HUME's objections to the Order of Jesuits. This has, at first sight, some appearance of candor; but how does MR. DALLAS state

“ kinds. But she refused to enter into any treaty with him. Pius the Fifth that succeeded him in that Chair, resolved to contrive her death, as is related by him that writes his life. The unfortunate Queen of Scotland was forced to take sanctuary in England; where it was resolved to use her well, and to restore her to her Crown and Country. But her own officious friends, and the frequent plots that were laid for taking away the Queen's life, brought on her the calamities of a long Imprisonment, that ended in a tragical death: which though it was the greatest blemish of this reign, yet was made in some sort justifiable, if not necessary, by the many attempts that the Papists made, on the Queen's life; and by the Deposition which Pope Pius the Fifth thundered out against her; from which it was inferred, that as long as that party had the hopes of such a successor, the Queen's life was not safe, nor her Government secure.

“ This led her, towards the end of her reign, to greater severities against those of the Roman Communion, of which a copious account is given by Sir Francis Walsingham, that was so many years employed, either in foreign Embassies, or in the secrets of state at home; that none knew better than he did the hidden springs that moved and directed all her councils.

“ He writ a long letter to a Frenchman, giving him an account of all the severities of the Queen's Government, both against Papists and Puritans; the substance of which is, That the Queen laid down two maxims of State: the one was, not to enforce consciences; the other was, not to let factious practices go unpunished, because they were covered with the pretences of conscience: at first she did not revive those severe laws passed in her father's time, by which the refusal of the oath of Supremacy was made Treason, but left her people to the freedom of their thoughts, and made it only penal to extol a foreign jurisdiction: she also laid aside the word Supreme Head, and the refusers of the oath were only disabled from holding benefices, or charges, during the refusal.

“ Upon Pius the Fifth's excommunicating her, though the Rebellion in the North was chiefly occasioned by that, she only made a law against the bringing over, or publishing of Bulls; and the venting of Agnus Dei's or such other Love-tokens, which were sent from Rome, on design to draw the hearts of her people from her, which were no

the question? He represents HUME's objections to be "their "zeal for Proselytism," and "their cultivation of learning "for the nourishment of superstition;" and he then replies to these objections: but before he attempted to answer HUME's objections, he should at least have let HUME speak for himself.

First, as to the Jesuits' "zeal for proselytism;" HUME's account of that zeal is as follows, by which it appears that their zeal for proselytism was rather political than religious. "The restless and enterprising spirit" (says he) "of the Catholic Church, PARTICULARLY OF THE JESUITS, is in some degree dangerous to every other communion: such *zeal of Proselytism* actuates that sect, that its Missionaries have penetrated into every nation of the globe, and in one sense "there is a *Popish Plot* perpetually carrying on against all "States, Protestant, Pagan, and Mahometan." (Hume's History, Charles II. Anno 1678.) MR. DALLAS, therefore, in treating HUME's charge of a "zeal for proselytism" as a RELIGIOUS zeal, has neither stated HUME's sentiments, nor refuted his arguments, but has merely produced another view of the subject, which was not taken by HUME himself; and has then combated that imaginary view. HUME does not accuse them of a *religious* zeal, as MR. DALLAS chooses to represent; but of a *political* zeal, hostile to all other religions and governments except their own.

"essential parts of that Religion; so that this could hurt none of their "consciences. But when, after the 20th year of her reign, it appeared "that the King of Spain designed to invade her Dominions, and that "the Priests that were sent over from the Seminaries from beyond sea, "were generally employed to corrupt the subjects in their allegiance, "by which, Treason was carried in the clouds, and infused secretly in "confession; then pecuniary punishments were inflicted on such as "withdrew from the Church: and in conclusion she was forced to "make Laws of greater rigour, but did often mitigate the severity of "them, to all that would promise to adhere to her, in case of a foreign "Invasion." See Burnet's Abridgment of the History of the Reformation, Book iv. p. 381.

2dly, MR. DALLAS, in representing HUME to have charged the Jesuits with *cultivating learning for the nourishment of superstition*, has made HUME assert what he never did. HUME's words are as follows: "This reproach they must bear "from posterity, that by the very nature of their Institution "they were engaged to *pervert learning, the only effectual remedy against superstition, into a nourishment of that infirmity*; and as their erudition was chiefly of the ecclesiastical and scholastic kind (though a few members have "cultivated polite literature), they were only the more enabled "by that acquisition to refine away the plainest dictates of "morality, and to erect a regular system of casuistry, by which "prevarication, perjury, and every crime when it served their "ghostly purposes, might be justified and defended." (See Hume's History—Elizabeth, ch. 41. Anno 1581.)

The above want of fidelity in making HUME state that the Jesuits *cultivated* learning, for the encouragement of superstition (when HUME charges them with "*perverting*" it), in order that MR. DALLAS might be then let in to shew that the Jesuits were *justified* in cultivating learning, as he then proceeds to do, is a circumstance which requires no comment.

MR. DALLAS, however, not only misrepresents these objections of HUME to the Order, but he suppresses HUME's other objection; as, 1st, *their violent hatred of, and opposition to QUEEN ELIZABETH*, occurring in the following passage: "They "infused" (says HUME) "into all their votaries, an extreme "hatred against the Queen, whom they treated as an usurper, "a Heretic, a persecutor of the orthodox, and one solemnly "and publicly anathematized by the holy Father. Sedition, "rebellion, sometimes assassination, were the expedients by "which they intended to effect their purposes against her; "and the severe restraint, not to say persecution, under which "the Catholics laboured, made them the more willingly receive "from their ghostly fathers such violent doctrines."—Hume's History—Elizabeth, ch. 41. Anno 1581.

2dly. MR. DALLAS does not notice HUME's objection to

the training of the Jesuits and Priests abroad, for the express purpose of inculcating rebellion in England, as thus expressed: “These seminaries” (those of Rome, Rheims, and Douay), “founded with a hostile intention, sent over every year a colony of Priests, who maintained the Catholic superstition in its full height of bigotry; and being educated with a view to the crown of martyrdom, were not deterred either by danger or fatigue, from maintaining and propagating their principles.”—Hume’s History, *Ibid.*

3dly. MR. DALLAS does not notice HUME’s next objection, which goes to *the dangerous inculcation by the Jesuits of the doctrine of Papal Supremacy*, as occurring in the following passage: “The Jesuits, as devoted servants of the Court of Rome, exalted the prerogative of the Sovereign Pontiff above all earthly power; and, by maintaining his authority of deposing Kings, set no bounds either to his spiritual or temporal jurisdiction. This doctrine became so prevalent among the zealous Catholics in England, that the excommunication fulminated against Elizabeth, excited many scruples of a singular kind, to which it behoved the Holy Father to provide a remedy. The Bull of PIUS, in absolving the subjects from their oaths of allegiance, commanded them to resist the Queen’s usurpation.”—Hume’s History, *Ibid.*

After these observations which have been left on record by HUME, with what face does MR. DALLAS affirm (in p. 58) that “*the treasons and crimes which have been imputed to the Jesuits, HUME HIMSELF HAS SHEWN, were falsely charged to them?*”

There really is an audacity in this attempt to distort the evidence of a modern Historian, whose work is in the hands of every one, which it is presumed can only tend to excite the indignation of all sincere inquirers after truth.

It may suffice, however, to have merely produced these instances of suppression, leaving it to every reader to draw his own inferences.

We will now revert to the passages which MR. DALLAS

does quote from HUME, but which he has been already shewn to have quoted incorrectly.

“ Zeal for proselytism,” he says (p. 53), “ is a natural sentiment of the mind, and has been the chief propagator of every sect since the Reformation to the present moment, and not without symptoms of rebellion, and even of King-killing.”

To prove these counts of rebellion and king-killing, MR. DALLAS cites HUME on the subject of the Association, into which the heads of the Reformers in Scotland entered, for the purpose of resisting the tyranny and cruelty of QUEEN MARY of England (better known in this nation by the significant epithet of Bloody Queen Mary), and THE QUEEN REGENT OF SCOTLAND, MARY OF GUISE*; the simple object, however, of which Association, in the first instance, was to protect the Protestant faith, and its professors, from utter destruction, and afterwards to establish the Protestant religion in the room of the Romish.

It was in that æra of darkness and bloodshed, that the Protestants of Scotland felt it necessary to speak plainly respecting a system which threatened nothing less than the extinction of the Protestant religion, and the destruction of its supporters. That the language of their bond, as given by HUME, does not read very classically in the nineteenth Century, may be readily conceded †; but so far as its spirit is con-

* “ She was a branch of the family of all Europe that was most zealously addicted to the old superstition; and her interest, joined with the Clergy’s, engaged the King to become a violent persecutor of all that were of another mind.”—BURNET’s History of the Reformation, abridged by himself, p. 268.

† It is not very clear that such distinguished characters as the Earl of Argyle, his son Lord Lorne, the Earls of Morton and Glencarne, Erskine of Dun, and the other Heads of the Reformers, ever signed the Bond or Convention, with which HUME is pleased to connect their names, in his 38th chapter (Ann. 1559), since it contains both false concord, and many vulgarisms. An observation of PROFESSOR ROBERTSON, in his History of Scotland, on the official papers of that time,

cerned, it only proclaims the free exercise of the Protestant religion as the inalienable privilege of those who subscribed it, and their determination to assert that right; and it is not true, as asserted by MR. DALLAS and HUME, that it breathes in any part the language of rebellion: nor can that provision which followed it be called by so harsh a name, which merely ordained, “*that prayers in the vulgar tongue should be used in the Churches, and that the interpretation of the Scriptures should be practised in private houses, till God should move the Prince to grant public preaching by faithful and true Ministers.*”

The case was, that the religion of two Popish Queens rendered it necessary in the first place for persons to pray in Latin. The Scotch, who are great lovers of common sense, thought (as the English did also), that there was something very repugnant to Scripture and reason in such an imposition on the conscience being enforced by royal authority; and therefore chose to assert their right, as men, and Christians, to worship God in a language which they understood: and in the next place, it having been ordained by the same authority that no interpretation of Scripture should take place in public except by the Popish Clergy, whom the people of Scotland considered as ministers of a corrupt and idolatrous

tends in a considerable degree to weaken the authority of this document, upon the ground of internal evidence:—“*The Act of deprivation*” (says Robertson), “*and a Letter from the Lords of the Congregation to the Queen Regent, are still extant; they discover not only that masculine and undaunted spirit, natural to men capable of so bold a resolution; but are remarkable for a precision and vigour of expression, which we are surprised to meet with in an age so unpolished.* The same observation may be made with respect to *the other public papers* of that period: the ignorance or bad taste of an age may render the compositions of authors by profession obscure, or affected, or absurd; but the language of business is nearly the same at all times; and wherever men think clearly, and are thoroughly interested, they express themselves with perspicuity and force.”—Robertson’s Scotland, vol. i. book ii. p. 416, 16th Edition of his works.

religion, they determined to absent themselves from public worship, until a more pure and faithful exposition of Scripture could be obtained.

Such is the amount of their *rebellion*, as set forth by HUME and MR. DALLAS: they might indeed have gone further, and shewn that acts of direct hostility against Popery, its ministers and its mummery, followed this public declaration; but to what does all this argument tend? It only proves that the people of Scotland and England have had sufficient wisdom and vigour to maintain the palpable and manifest right of serving God, according to the dictates of their own consciences; a right which no Church but the Church of Rome would deny, and no reasoners except the secret or avowed friends of that Church would dispute.

With regard to the charge of “king-killing” which MR. DALLAS places to the account of the Scotch Reformers, and represents to arise from their “*zeal for proselytism*,” he does not even attempt to produce a single instance of this crime; but quotes HUME largely; for the purpose of shewing that KNOX, the great instrument and promoter of the Reformation in Scotland, used violent and threatening language to MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS, from which we are to infer, if we please, that KNOX and his colleagues were Regicides.

A slight sketch of KNOX’s history may not perhaps be unacceptable.

When Popery was the established religion in Scotland, this eminent man (who had been one of the chaplains of King Edward VI.) narrowly escaped with his life from Cardinal Beaton, the Archbishop of Glasgow, and Bishop Hamilton; and he was afterwards cited before Bishop Tonstall, for preaching against the mass: he was compelled to quit England by the persecution of Protestants, which arose on Queen MARY’s accession to the throne. Returning however to Scotland in 1559, just as a public prosecution was carrying on against the Protestants, who were about to be tried at Stirling (through the treachery of the Queen Regent, who had promised them

her protection), he did not hesitate to join their ranks, and share their dangers. He preached publicly against the idolatrous religion of the Church of Rome, and the corrupt lives of its Clergy. By the most bold and intrepid conduct, he exposed the abuses of Popery, and animated the nation against it, promoting the Reformation by every means in his power, in which he spared no labour, and dreaded no danger. He corresponded with CECIL the able and faithful minister of QUEEN ELIZABETH, and by that means was chiefly instrumental in establishing those negotiations between "the Congregation," and the English, which terminated in the march of an English army into Scotland, under the orders of QUEEN ELIZABETH, to assist the Protestants, and to protect them against the persecutions of the Popish Queen Regent. This army being joined by almost all the principal men of Scotland, proceeded with such vigour and success that they obliged the French forces, who had been the principal support of the Queen Regent's tyranny, to evacuate the kingdom, and thus restored the Parliament to its former independence. Of that body, a great majority had embraced the Protestant Religion; and, encouraged by the ardour and number of their friends, they improved every opportunity which occurred of overthrowing the whole fabric of Popery. They sanctioned the Confession of Faith submitted to them by KNOX, and the other reformed ministers. They abolished the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts (those main wheels in the engine of Papal domination), and transferred the causes to the cognizance of the civil courts; and they prohibited the exercise of religious worship according to the rites of the Romish Church.

On the death of the Queen Regent, MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS arrived from France, and immediately established the Popish service in her own chapel, which by her protection and countenance was much frequented: KNOX opposed this, as he did the other evidences given by MARY of her attachment to the Romish cause. An act of the Queen's Privy Council having been proclaimed at Edinburgh, immediately after MARY's

arrival, forbidding any disturbance to be given to the Mass; under pain of death, KNOX openly declared against it in his sermon on the following Sunday: when MARY married a Papist, he preached another sermon expressing his abhorrence of such an alliance; and when her Popish husband went to hear him preach, he took occasion to speak of “the government “ of wicked princes, who for the sins of the people are sent “ as tyrants and scourges to plague them; and among other “ things he said that God sets over them, for their offences “ and ingratitude, boys and women.” Such plain and honest dealing as this was not likely to be very palatable to a Popish court, and he was silenced. By no means deterred however, he went on in private with the great work of the Reformation, and was one of the most active and successful instruments in eventually delivering Scotland from Papal corruption, regal tyranny, and priestly domination. He lived to preach against the awful massacre of the Protestants in Paris, on St. Bartholomew’s day, and desired that the French Ambassador might be informed that he had done so. He died the 24th of November, 1572, and was interred at Edinburgh, several Lords attending his funeral, and particularly the EARL OF MORTON, who was on that day chosen Regent of Scotland, and who, as soon as he was laid in his grave, exclaimed, “ There lies one who never feared the face of man; who has “ been often threatened with dirk and dagger, but yet has “ ended his days in peace and honour; for he had God’s pro- “ vidence watching over him in a special manner whenever his “ life was sought.”—(See Cook’s History of the Reformation in Scotland, and McCrie’s Life of Knox.)

The absolute necessity of a Reformation in Scotland will best appear from the luminous and powerful observations of PROFESSOR ROBERTSON (in his History of Scotland) upon the state of Popery in that country, at the period when KNOX appeared:—

“ The Reformation is one of the greatest events in the

“ history of mankind, and, in whatever point of light we view
“ it, is instructive and interesting.

“ The revival of learning in the fifteenth and sixteenth
“ centuries roused the world from that lethargy in which it
“ had been sunk for many ages. The human mind felt its
“ own strength, broke the fetters of authority by which it had
“ been so long restrained, and venturing to move in a larger
“ sphere, pushed its inquiries into every subject with great
“ boldness and surprising success.

“ No sooner did mankind recover the capacity of exer-
“ cising their reason, than religion was one of the first objects
“ which drew their attention. Long before Luther published
“ his famous Theses, which shook the Papal throne, science
“ and philosophy had laid open, to many of the Italians, the
“ imposture and absurdity of the established superstition.
“ That subtle and refined people, satisfied with enjoying those
“ discoveries in secret, were little disposed to assume the dan-
“ gerous character of reformers, and concluded the knowledge
“ of truth to be the prerogative of the wise, while vulgar
“ minds must be overawed and governed by popular errors.
“ But, animated with a more noble and disinterested zeal, the
“ German theologian boldly erected the standard of truth, and
“ upheld it with an unconquerable intrepidity, which merits
“ the admiration and gratitude of all succeeding ages. The
“ occasion of Luther’s being first disgusted with the tenets of
“ the Romish Church, and how, from a small rupture, the
“ quarrel widened into an irreparable breach, is known to
“ every one who has been the least conversant in history.
“ From the heart of Germany his opinions spread, with asto-
“ nishing rapidity, all over Europe; and, wherever they
“ came, endangered or overturned the ancient but ill-founded
“ system. The vigilance and address of the court of Rome,
“ co-operating with the power and bigotry of the Austrian
“ family, suppressed these notions on their first appearance, in
“ the southern kingdoms of Europe. But the fierce spirit of

“ the north, irritated by multiplied impositions, could neither
 “ be mollified by the same arts, nor subdued by the same
 “ force; and encouraged by some princes from piety, and by
 “ others out of avarice, it easily bore down the feeble opposi-
 “ tion of an illiterate and immoral clergy.

“ The superstition of Popery seems to have grown to the
 “ most extravagant height in those countries which are situ-
 “ ated towards the different extremities of Europe. The vigour
 “ of imagination, and sensibility of frame, peculiar to the in-
 “ habitants of southern climates, rendered them susceptible of
 “ the deepest impressions of superstitious terror and credulity.
 “ Ignorance and barbarity were no less favourable to the pro-
 “ gress of the same spirit among the northern nations. They
 “ knew little, and were disposed to believe every thing. The
 “ most glaring absurdities did not shock their gross under-
 “ standings, and the most improbable fictions were received
 “ with implicit assent and admiration.

“ Accordingly, that form of Popery which prevailed in
 “ Scotland, was of the most bigoted and illiberal kind. Those
 “ doctrines which are most apt to shock the human under-
 “ standing, and those legends which farthest exceed belief,
 “ were proposed to the people without any attempt to pal-
 “ liate or disguise them; nor did they ever call in question
 “ the reasonableness of the one, or the truth of the other *.

“ The power and wealth of the Church kept pace with the
 “ progress of superstition; for, it is the nature of that spirit
 “ to observe no bounds in its respect and liberality towards
 “ those whose character it esteems sacred. The Scottish kings

* “ The same spirit of ignorance, immorality, and superstition had
 “ overrun the Clergy in Scotland, that was so much complained of in
 “ the other parts of Europe; only it may be supposed, that in nations
 “ less polite and learned, it was in proportion greater than it was else-
 “ where; the total neglect of the pastoral care, and the gross scandals
 “ of the Clergy, possessed the people with such prejudices against them,
 “ that they were easily disposed to hearken to new preachers.”—Bur-
 net’s History of the Reformation, abridged by himself, p. 265.

“ early demonstrated how much they were under its influence,
“ by their vast additions to the immunities and riches of the
“ Clergy. The profuse piety of David I. who acquired on
“ that account the name of Saint, transferred almost the
“ whole crown-lands, which were at that time of great extent,
“ into the hands of Ecclesiastics. The example of that vir-
“ tuous prince was imitated by his successors. The spirit
“ spread among all orders of men, who daily loaded the priest-
“ hood with new possessions. The riches of the Church all
“ over Europe were exorbitant; but Scotland was one of
“ those countries wherein they had farthest exceeded the just
“ proportion. The Scottish Clergy paid one half of every tax
“ imposed on land; and as there is no reason to think that
“ in that age they could be loaded with any unequal share
“ of the burden, we may conclude that, by the time of the
“ Reformation, little less than one half of the national property
“ had fallen into the hands of a society, which is always acquir-
“ ing, and can never lose.

“ The nature, too, of a considerable part of their property,
“ extended the influence of the Clergy. Many estates,
“ throughout the kingdom, held of the Church; Church lands
“ were let on lease at an easy rent, and were possessed by the
“ younger sons and descendants of the best families. The
“ connexion between *superior* and *vassal*, between landlord and
“ tenant, created dependencies, and gave rise to an union of
“ great advantage to the Church; and in estimating the in-
“ fluence of the Popish Ecclesiastics over the nation, these, as
“ well as the real amount of their revenues, must be attended
“ to, and taken into the account.

“ This extraordinary share in the national property was
“ accompanied with proportionable weight in the supreme
“ council of the kingdom. At a time when the number of the
“ temporal Peers was extremely small, and when the lesser
“ barons and representatives of boroughs seldom attended
“ Parliaments, the Ecclesiastics formed a considerable body
“ there. It appears from the ancient rolls of Parliament, and

“ from the manner of choosing the Lords of Articles, that the
“ proceedings of that high court must have been, in a great
“ measure, under their direction.

“ The reverence due to their sacred character, which was
“ often carried incredibly far, contributed not a little towards
“ the growth of their power. The dignity, the titles, and
“ precedence of the Popish Clergy, are remarkable, both as
“ causes and effects of that dominion which they had acquired
“ over the rest of mankind. They were regarded by the cre-
“ dulous laity as beings of a superior species; they were nei-
“ ther subject to the same laws, nor tried by the same judges.
“ Every guard that religion could supply, was placed around
“ their power, their possessions, and their persons; and en-
“ deavours were used, not without success, to represent them
“ all as equally sacred.

“ The reputation for learning, which, however inconsider-
“ able, was wholly engrossed by the Clergy, added to the reve-
“ rence which they derived from religion. The principles of
“ sound philosophy, and of a just taste, were altogether un-
“ known: in place of these were substituted studies barbarous
“ and uninstructive; but as the Ecclesiastics alone were con-
“ versant in them, this procured them esteem; and a very
“ slender portion of knowledge drew the admiration of rude
“ ages, which knew little. War was the sole profession of the
“ nobles, and hunting their chief amusement; they divided
“ their time between these: unacquainted with the arts, and
“ unimproved by science, they disdained any employment fo-
“ reign from military affairs, or which required rather pene-
“ tration and address, than bodily vigour. Wherever the
“ former were necessary, the Clergy were intrusted; because
“ they alone were properly qualified for the trust. Almost all
“ the high offices in civil government devolved, on this ac-
“ count, into their hands. The Lord Chancellor was the first
“ subject in the kingdom, both in dignity and in power.
“ From the earliest ages of the monarchy, to the death of
“ Cardinal Beaton, fifty-four persons had held that high

“ office ; and of these, forty-three had been Ecclesiastics. The
“ Lords of Session were supreme judges in all matters of civil
“ right ; and by its original constitution, the president and
“ one half of the senators in this court were churchmen. To
“ all this we may add, that the Clergy being separated from
“ the rest of mankind by the law of celibacy, and undis-
“ tracted by those cares, and unincumbered with those bur-
“ dens, which occupy and oppress other men, the interest of
“ their Order became their only object, and they were at full
“ leisure to pursue it.

“ The nature of their function gave them access to all
“ persons, and at all seasons. They could employ all the
“ motives of fear and of hope, of terror and of consolation,
“ which operate most powerfully on the human mind.

“ They haunted the weak and the credulous ; they be-
“ sieged the beds of the sick and of the dying ; they suffered
“ few to go out of the world without leaving marks of their
“ liberality to the church, and taught them to compound with
“ the Almighty for their sins, by bestowing riches upon those
“ who called themselves his servants.

“ When their own industry, or the superstition of man-
“ kind, failed of producing this effect, the Ecclesiastics had
“ influence enough to call in the aid of law. When a person
“ died *intestate*, the disposal of his effects was vested in the
“ Bishop of the diocese, after paying his funeral charges and
“ debts, and distributing among his kindred the sums to which
“ they were respectively entitled ; it being presumed that no
“ Christian would have chosen to leave the world without des-
“ tining some part of his substance to pious uses. As men
“ are apt to trust to the continuance of life with a fond confi-
“ dence, and childishly shun every thing that forces them to
“ think of their mortality, many die without settling their
“ affairs by Will ; and the right of administration in that
“ event, acquired by the Clergy, must have proved a consi-
“ derable source of wealth and of power to the Church.

“ At the same time, no matrimonial or testamentary cause

“ could be tried but in the spiritual courts, and by laws which
“ the Clergy themselves had framed. The penalty, too, by
“ which the decisions of these courts were enforced, added
“ to their authority. A sentence of excommunication was no
“ less formidable than a sentence of outlawry. It was pro-
“ nounced on many occasions, and against various crimes;
“ and, besides excluding those upon whom it fell, from Chris-
“ tian privileges, it deprived them of all their rights as men
“ or as citizens; and the aid of the secular power concurred
“ with the superstition of mankind, in rendering the thun-
“ ders of the Church no less destructive than terrible.

“ To these general causes may be attributed the immense
“ growth both of the wealth and power of the Popish Church;
“ and, without entering into any more minute detail, this may
“ serve to discover the foundations on which a structure so
“ stupendous was erected.

“ But though the Laity had contributed, by their own su-
“ persition and profuseness, to raise the Clergy from poverty
“ and obscurity to riches and eminence, they began, by de-
“ grees, to feel and to murmur at their encroachments. No
“ wonder haughty and martial barons should view the power
“ and possessions of the Church with envy, and regard the lazy
“ and inactive character of Churchmen with the utmost con-
“ tempt; while, at the same time, the indecent and licentious
“ lives of the Clergy gave great and just offence to the people,
“ and considerably abated the veneration which they were accus-
“ tomed to yield to that order of men. Immense wealth, ex-
“ treme indolence, gross ignorance, and, above all, the severe
“ injunction of celibacy, had concurred to introduce this cor-
“ ruption of morals among many of the Clergy; who, presuming
“ too much upon the submission of the people, were at no pains
“ either to conceal or to disguise their own vices. According
“ to the accounts of the Reformers, confirmed by several Po-
“ pish writers, the most open and scandalous dissolution of
“ manners prevailed among the Scottish Clergy. Cardinal
“ Beaton, with the same public pomp which is due to a legi-

“ timate child, celebrated the marriage of his natural daughter with the Earl of Crawford’s son; and, if we may believe Knox, he publicly continued, to the end of his days, a criminal correspondence with her mother, who was a woman of rank. The other Prelates seem not to have been more regular and exemplary than their Primate.

“ Men of such characters ought, in reason, to have been alarmed at the first clamours raised against their own morals, and the doctrines of the Church, by the Protestant preachers; but the Popish Ecclesiastics, either out of pride or ignorance, neglected the proper methods for silencing them. Instead of reforming their lives, or disguising their vices, they affected to despise the censures of the people. While the Reformers, by their mortifications and austeries, endeavoured to resemble the first propagators of Christianity, the Popish Clergy were compared to all those persons who are most infamous in history for the enormity and scandal of their crimes.

“ On the other hand, instead of mitigating the rigour, or colouring over the absurdity of the established doctrines; instead of attempting to found them upon Scripture, or to reconcile them to reason, they left them without any other support or recommendation, than the authority of the Church and the Decrees of Councils. The fables concerning purgatory, the virtues of pilgrimage, and the merits of the saints, were the topics on which they insisted in their discourses to the people; and the duty of preaching being left wholly to monks of the lowest and most illiterate orders, their compositions were still more wretched and contemptible than the subjects on which they insisted. While the Reformers were attended by crowded and admiring audiences, the Popish Priests were either universally deserted, or listened to with scorn.

“ The only device which they employed in order to recover their declining reputation, or to confirm the wavering faith of the people, was equally imprudent and unsuccessful.

“ As many doctrines of their Church had derived their credit
“ at first from the authority of false miracles, they now en-
“ deavoured to call in these to their aid. But such lying
“ wonders, as were beheld with unsuspicuous admiration, or
“ heard with implicit faith, in times of darkness and of igno-
“ rance, met with a very different reception in a more enlight-
“ ened period. The vigilance of the Reformers detected
“ these impostures, and exposed not only them, but the
“ cause which needed the aid of such artifices, to ridicule.

“ As the Popish Ecclesiastics became more and more the
“ objects of hatred and of contempt, the discourses of the Re-
“ formers were listened to as so many calls to liberty; and
“ besides the pious indignation which they excited against
“ those corrupt doctrines which had perverted the nature of
“ true Christianity; besides the zeal which they inspired for
“ the knowledge of truth and the purity of religion; they gave
“ rise also, among the Scottish nobles, to other views and pas-
“ sions. They hoped to shake off the yoke of ecclesiastical do-
“ minion, which they had long felt to be oppressive, and which
“ they now discovered to be unchristian. They expected to
“ recover possession of the Church revenues, which they were
“ now taught to consider as alienations made by their ancestors,
“ with a profusion no less undiscerning than unbounded. They
“ flattered themselves, that a check would be given to the pride
“ and luxury of the Clergy, who would be obliged henceforward
“ to confine themselves within the sphere peculiar to their sa-
“ cred character. An aversion for the Established Church,
“ which flowed from so many concurring causes, which was
“ raised by considerations of religion, heightened by motives
“ of policy, and instigated by prospects of private advantage,
“ spread fast through the nation, and excited a spirit, that
“ burst out at last with irresistible violence.

“ Religious considerations alone were sufficient to have
“ roused this spirit. The points in controversy with the
“ Church of Rome were of so much importance to the happi-
“ ness of mankind, and so essential to Christianity, that they

“ merited all the zeal with which the Reformers contended in
“ order to establish them. But the Reformation having been
“ represented as the effect of some wild and enthusiastic frenzy
“ in the human mind, this attempt to account for the eager-
“ ness and zeal with which our ancestors embraced and propa-
“ gated the Protestant doctrines, by taking a view of the poli-
“ tical motives alone which influenced them, and by shewing
“ how naturally these prompted them to act with so much
“ ardour, will not, perhaps, be deemed an unnecessary digres-
“ sion.”—Robertson’s History of Scotland, vol. i. p. 357.
16th Edition of his works.

It will be evident from the above statement of PROFESSOR ROBERTSON relative to Popery in Scotland, that a Reformation was quite as necessary there, as it is, and must be, wherever else that Religion prevails. With regard to ROBERTSON’s opinion of KNOX himself, it appears from the following Extract that he regarded him as an Instrument eminently qualified for accomplishing the great object of Religious reform; and that he considered Scotland primarily, England collaterally, and the world generally, as all under infinite obligations to that distinguished character.

“ In a short time the doctrines and writings of the foreign
“ Reformers became generally known; the inquisitive genius
“ of the age pressed forward in quest of truth; the discovery
“ of one error opened the way to others; the downfal of one
“ imposture drew many after it; the whole fabric which ig-
“ norance and superstition had erected in times of darkness
“ began to totter; and nothing was wanting to complete its
“ ruin, but a daring and active leader to direct the attack.
“ Such was the famous JOHN KNOX, who, with better qualifi-
“ cations of learning, and more extensive views, than any
“ of his predecessors in Scotland, possessed a natural intre-
“ pidity of mind, which set him above fear. He began his
“ public ministry at St. Andrews, in the year one thousand
“ five hundred and forty-seven, with that success which
“ always accompanies a bold and popular eloquence. Instead

“ of amusing himself with lopping the branches, he struck
“ directly at the root of Popery, and attacked both the doc-
“ trine and discipline of the Established Church, with a ve-
“ hemence peculiar to himself, *but admirably suited to the*
“ *temper and wishes of the age.*”

“ The ambition of the House of Guise, and the bigotry
“ of Mary of England, hastened the subversion of the Papal
“ throne in Scotland ; and, by a singular disposition of Pro-
“ vidence, the persons who opposed the Reformation in every
“ other part of Europe with the fiercest zeal, were made in-
“ struments for advancing it in that kingdom.”—Robert-
son’s History of Scotland, Book ii. pages 336. 339. 16th
Edit. of his works.

When HUME asserts, that “ the violent invasion of the
“ *established Religion* (by KNOX and THE CONGREGATION),
“ was the actual commencement of Rebellion,”—and when
MR. DALLAS quotes that passage from HUME, in order to
shew that other sects, besides Catholics, have rebelled against
reigning authorities, it is fit that the people of England
should be reminded that KNOX and THE CONGREGATION op-
posed *Popery in power* (for that was “ the established Reli-
“ gion”), and rebelled against Foreigners and Papists who
had forged chains for their consciences, imprisoned their per-
sons, confiscated their property, and silenced their Preachers:
the public must be reminded, that it was against an intolerant
and cruel Religion that KNOX and his adherents declared
themselves, and that it was against a foreign yoke and a
French army that they protested; in opposing which, they
were content to hazard their lives, and shed their blood.

When these facts are adverted to, it will be seen whether
the British Public will agree in opinion with HUME, that
“ KNOX’s political principles, which he communicated to his
“ brethren, were as full of sedition as his theological were of
“ rage and bigotry:” it will be also seen, whether the same
Public will then agree with MR. DALLAS, in his assertion
(p. 56), that “ nothing can exceed the insolence and seditious

“ spirit of the Reformers;” and that Public will also better learn how to appreciate the propriety of MR. DALLAS’s applying to the conduct of the Scotch Reformers the phrase of “ symptoms of rebellion, and even of king-killing.” It is certain, indeed, that the Protestants of Scotland, when ripe for throwing off the Papal domination, did not proceed in quite so courtly a manner as HUME and MR. DALLAS would have had them—nor did the Protestants of England, when they meant to throw off the Papal yoke of King James II. observe much better manners.

When men feel that their lives are at stake, and that their religious liberties and privileges (dearer even than life itself) are in question, they may be excused for strong language and vigorous measures. Indifference and apathy belong only to those who have nothing to gain, or nothing to lose; but men who were placed in the situation of the Scotch Reformers had no time for compliment, and no talent for dissimulation: they went straight forward, and the event shewed that they had taken the right course: they did not flatter the corruptions which they meant to extirpate, nor deal very tenderly with a system which they intended to overthrow.

They found KNOX in Scotland precisely what the Protestants found LUTHER in Germany; and neither of these characters temporized or trifled, in a case of such vital importance, where the eyes of the world were upon them, and where so much depended upon their ardor and exertion.

The Defender of the Jesuits may stigmatize their conduct as seditious and “ rebellious,” but he must be informed that it was the operation of similar principles, which wrought deliverance for Scotland on this occasion, and effected it for England at the glorious Revolution of 1688; and, therefore, that he is not justified in applying such odious epithets to the conduct of a people struggling for their just rights, both civil and religious, of which Popery (that sworn foe to all other claims but its own) would otherwise have deprived them.

MR. DALLAS (after having contended for the “ zeal for

“ proselytism” as a legitimate spring of action in Catholics, “ if unconnected with the treasons, persecutions, and vices, “ so abundantly charged upon Catholics”) observes, p. 57, that “ the zeal for proselytism daily thins the Established Church of England, and increases the Congregations of the innumerable denominations of sectaries, which are tolerated in this country;” by which he proposes a parallel between the persecuting and exclusive zeal of Popery, and the desire entertained by the various sects among Protestants to impress their own modes of thinking upon others. With regard to the statement, that “ the zeal for proselytism in itself can be no crime, if unconnected with the treasons, persecutions, and vices, so abundantly charged upon the Catholics,” it may be observed, that the zeal of the Jesuits and their adherents *never has been* “ unconnected with treasons, persecutions, and vices,” and that thus their zeal cannot be considered except in connexion with its excesses. The effort, therefore, of MR. DALLAS to disunite them must fail; and much more will his attempt to shew any analogy between the political dangers of Jesuitism and of Popery, and the religious errors of our Protestant sectaries, for this simple reason, that whatever may be the mistakes of some classes of Dissenters, they affect only themselves, and do not oblige them to perpetual hostility against a Protestant Throne, a Protestant Government, and a Protestant Parliament. It will not be denied by the firmest friend of the Jesuits, that for a very considerable time past, the Dissenters from our own national Establishment have yielded to no class of his Majesty’s subjects in loyalty and obedience; and any inuendoes or suggestions to the contrary are wholly unmerited by them, and unworthy of their calumniators. Reposing as they all do under the broad shade of our tolerant Establishment, the Dissenters are wise enough to know that they have little to gain and every thing to lose, by any change which could take place; and they are especially impressed with a sense of this great truth, namely, that a change from a *Protestant* to a *Popish* establishment, in other

words, from a tolerant to an intolerant system of government, would only involve them in one common ruin with the more regular and orthodox members of the Establishment. They are not so ill read in History, nor so ignorant of human nature, as to be insensible of this fact, that whatever of exemption or privilege, Popery might have to offer them as an inducement to disloyalty or disobedience, Dissenters would only, in the event of Popery assuming the reins of power, be indulged with the privilege which POLYPHEMUS offered to ULYSSES, of being devoured last. The Dissenter of England owes no external allegiance, admits no spiritual supremacy, professes no pernicious casuistry, and believes that those who essentially differ from him upon the subject of religion, may yet be in the way of salvation ; and at all events may go on to differ from him, without molestation or injury. In the great fundamentals of religion, the Dissenters, as a body, hold the same doctrines as the Establishment ; abhor alike the errors and corruptions of the Romish Church ; and equally maintain the rights of conscience, and the liberty of the subject.

No analogy, therefore, can be shewn by MR. DALLAS, to subsist between the cases of the sectaries of England, and the emissaries of Rome : nor can any coincidence be established by him between the political crimes and vices of the Jesuits, and the religious aberrations of the Dissenters. The things are essentially distinct, and must eternally remain so, in spite of MR. DALLAS's desire to confound them together ; and therefore his attempt to make Protestant Dissent a *particeps criminis* with Catholic Intolerance, will not avail him.

MR. DALLAS, in p. 60, declares himself (*but, Credat Judæus*) " ATTACHED TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND."

This confession he perhaps considers necessary upon the same principle as certain defenders of the Jesuits considered it necessary to assure the world that they were not of that Order. MR. DALLAS being a good Frenchman, he may perhaps remember the phrase "*Qui s'excuse s'accuse.*"—How far the Church of England, as a body, may feel honoured or strength-

ened by MR. DALLAS's attachment, is perhaps a little problematical. The Church of England will probably say of such auxiliaries and defenders,

*Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis,
Tempus eget.*

Undoubtedly many individual members of the Church of England, who do not intend to yield to MR. DALLAS or any other friend of the Jesuits in cordial and unfeigned attachment to the doctrines and discipline of that Church (among whom the writer of these remarks must claim to be included), have considered that MR. DALLAS has adopted a most extraordinary mode of testifying his attachment to the Church of England, in becoming the champion and defender of a body of men who were established for the avowed purpose of opposing the Reformation by all the means in their power; who have never ceased, from their first origin, to disturb and persecute all the Reformed Churches of the world; and who must, from their very constitution, abhor the Church of England in particular, as more peculiarly opposed, through her whole history, to the abuses and corruptions of Popery both in doctrine and practice.

Let us, however, examine a little more closely into MR. DALLAS's pretensions of "attachment to the Church of England;" and in judging him from his own words, we shall find upon what sort of foundation his Churchmanship rests, and learn what are his opinions of the Reformation, which is at once the light and glory of the Church of England. "Attached" (he says) "*myself to the Church of England, it is nevertheless clear to me, that THE REFORMATION HAS GENERATED THE MOST ABSURD SUPERSTITIONS; and I cannot conceive that there is a man of unbiassed mind and good sense, who would not rather embrace all that has been retrenched from the Catholic creed, than adopt the spurious abominations and blasphemies which, every where, under the screen of toleration, disgrace the world:*" after which, as perhaps fearing lest he should have proceeded a step too

far, he carefully informs us, that he is “ not entering into a defence of the Romish Church.”

Now, if this be not a pretty resolute defence of the Romish Church, and a most virulent attack upon the Reformed Church, then has language ceased to have the meaning which we were taught to attach to it, when acquiring our mother tongue !

If a writer professing himself a member of the Church of England, will, notwithstanding, resolutely defend the sworn enemies of that Church, the simple fact of his adopting such a line of conduct will indeed help us to take the measure of his attachment to the Church of England with tolerable accuracy; but when he proceeds to slander the Reformation, by charging upon it “ the most absurd superstitions,” and by declaring that “ all that has been retrenched from the Catholic creed” (namely, all the errors and abuses which Protestants consider the corruptions of that creed, and have *therefore* retrenched from it) must be preferred to “ the abominations and blasphemies “ which every where, under the screen of toleration, disgrace “ the world,” we are spared the trouble of reasoning by inference or analogy; and we learn from MR. DALLAS’s own avowal, what are his true sentiments of the respective Churches of Rome and of England ! The mask, however, adroitly kept in its place before, now drops off, and the most incredulous must be convinced, that, since “ no man can serve two masters,” attachment to the Jesuits, and attachment to the Church of England, are utterly incompatible with each other.

After so unequivocal a statement, on the part of MR. DALLAS, of his abhorrence of the Reformation, it would perhaps be a hopeless task to endeavour to convince HIM that the Reformation was absolutely necessary to the world; but as his work is calculated to mislead many persons who want either leisure or inclination for examining this question, some observations on the state of Europe in general, and of England in particular, prior to the Reformation, may not be without their use; premising only, that whole volumes must be consulted

before any adequate idea can be formed of the midnight darkness and the midnight deeds of Popery, and therefore that the following testimony must only pass for a very scanty specimen of the nature of that evidence, which all History furnishes on this head. DEAN MILNER, in his admirable "HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST," observes as follows:—

" In a Manuscript history, extending from the year 1524 to 1541, composed by Frederic Myconius, a very able coadjutor of Luther and Melancthon, the author describes the state of religion in the beginning of the sixteenth century in striking terms. ' The passion and satisfaction of Christ were treated as a bare History, like the *Odyssey* of Homer. Concerning faith, by which the righteousness of the Redeemer and eternal life are apprehended, there was the deepest silence. Christ was described as a severe judge, ready to condemn all who were destitute of the intercession of saints, and of pontifical interest. (*Seckendorf*, vol. i. p. 4.) In the room of Christ were substituted as Saviours and Intercessors, the Virgin Mary, like a Pagan Diana, and other Saints, who from time to time had been created by the Popes. Nor were men, it seems, entitled to the benefit of their prayers, except they deserved it of them by their works. What sort of works was necessary for this end was distinctly explained; not the works prescribed in the decalogue, and enjoined on all mankind, but such as enriched the priests and monks. Those, who died neglecting these, were consigned to hell, or at least to purgatory, till they were redeemed from it by a satisfaction made either by themselves or by their proxies. The frequent pronunciation of the Lord's prayer and the salutation of the Virgin, and the recitations of the canonical hours, constantly engaged those who undertook to be religious. An incredible mass of ceremonious observances was every where visible; while gross wickedness was practised, under the encouragement of Indulgences, by which the guilt of the crimes was easily expiated. The preaching of the Word was the least part of the episcopal function:

“ rites and processions employed the bishops perpetually, when
“ engaged in religious exercises. The number of clergy was
“ enormous, and their lives were most scandalous. I speak of
“ those whom I have known in the town of Gothen, &c.”

“ If we add to this, the testimony of Pellicanus, another of
“ Luther’s followers, ‘ that a Greek Testament could not be
“ procured at any price in all Germany*,’ what can be
“ wanting to complete the picture of that darkness in which
“ men lived, and in what did the Christian nations differ from
“ Pagans, except in the name? It may be proper to mention,
“ that even the University of Paris, the first of all the fa-
“ mous schools of learning, could not furnish a single person
“ capable of supporting a controversy against Luther on the
“ foundation of Scripture. And scarcely any Christian Doctor
“ in the beginning of this century, had a critical knowledge of
“ the word of God. The reader may find it useful to be
“ detained a little longer, in contemplating the situation of
“ the Christian world at the time of Luther’s appearance.
“ The observations I have to offer for this purpose shall be
“ arranged under four distinct heads; and they will, I trust,
“ assist us in demonstrating the importance of the Reforma-
“ tion, and fully evince that the difference between Popery
“ and Protestantism is not merely verbal. 1. The Popish
“ doctrine of Indulgences was then in the highest reputation.
“ We shall be in no danger of misrepresenting this doctrine, if
“ we state it according to the ideas of one of the ablest cham-
“ pions of Popery†. The Church, he tells us, imposes pain-
“ ful works or sufferings on offenders; which, being discharged
“ or undergone with humility, are called satisfactions; and
“ when, regarding the fervor of the penitents, or other good

* The words of Seckendorf are remarkable: “ Tantam vero tem-
“ porum illorum ante Lutherum infelicitatem notasse Pellicanus dici-
“ tur, ut nullum Græcum Testamentum in tota Germania reperiri
“ potuerit, quantumvis quis magnam vim auri pro unico exemplari
“ voluisset expendere.”—P. 152, *Com. de Luth.* Ed. 2da, Lips. 1604.

† Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, in an exposition of the doctrine of the
Catholic Church in matters of controversy.

“ works, she remits some part of the task, this is called ‘ an Indulgence.’ For, he pretends that the infinite satisfaction of Christ may be applied in two ways, either by ‘ entire remission, without the reservation of any punishment, or by the changing of a greater punishment into a less.’ ‘ The first,’ he says, ‘ is done in baptism, the second in the case of sins committed after baptism.’ And here he gives us the authority of the Council of Trent, to support his assertion, ‘ namely, ‘ The power to grant Indulgences has been committed to the Church by Jesus Christ, and the use of them is beneficial to salvation.’ Those, he observes, who depart this life indebted to divine justice for some of the pains reserved, ‘ must suffer them in another life in the state of purgatory.

“ Reliefs are however provided in this case also: the benefit of Indulgences extends, it seems, beyond the grave, and the doctrine of commutation for offences, applied in real practice by the friends of the deceased, was held to be valid in heaven. The foundation of all this system was generally believed to be this. There was supposed to be an infinite treasure of merit in Christ and the Saints; which was abundantly more than sufficient for themselves: thus, what is strictly true of the Divine Saviour, was asserted also of Saints; namely, that they had done works of supererogation. This treasure was deposited in the Church, under the conduct of the See of Rome, and was sold,—for literally sold it was for money,—at that See’s direction to those who were able and willing to pay for it; and few were found willing to undergo the course of a severe penance of unpleasant austerities, when they could afford to commute for it by pecuniary payments. The Popes, and under them, the Bishops and the Clergy, particularly the Dominican and Franciscan friars, had the disposition of this treasure; and as the Pontiffs had the power of canonizing new saints at their own will, the fund was ever growing; and so long as the system could maintain its credit, the riches of their Church, thus secularized under the appearance of religion, became a

“ sea without a shore. No impartial examiner of authentic records will say, that I have overcharged this account of Indulgences. In fact, these were the symptoms of the last stage of Papal depravity; and as the moral evils, which they encouraged, were plain to every one not totally destitute of discernment, they were the first objects assaulted by the Reformers.

2. “ But the views of those wise and holy personages were far more extensive. They saw, that a practice so scandalously corrupt, was connected with the grossest ignorance of the nature of Gospel-grace. The doctrine of justification, in its explicit form, had been lost for many ages to the Christian world. If men had really believed, that by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ salvation was obtained, and that God ‘ justifies the ungodly’ through faith alone, how could they have been imposed on by the traffic of Indulgences? In whatever manner the Papist might subtilize and divide, he was compelled by his system to hold, that by a compliance with the rules of the Church, either in the way of Indulgences, or by some severer mode, pardon was to be obtained; and that the satisfaction of Christ was not sufficiently meritorious for this end; in other words, that the gift of God is *not* eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord. And, in fact, the preachers of Indulgences, whether Popes themselves or their Ministers, held out to the people with sufficient clearness, that the inheritance of eternal life was to be purchased by Indulgences. Proofs of this have already appeared in the course of this History, and more will be given hereafter. The testimony of Sleidan, one of the most judicious and dispassionate historians, to the nature of Indulgences, well deserves to be transcribed in this place. It is contained in the beginning of his excellent History. ‘ Pope Leo X. making use of that power, which his predecessors had usurped over all Christian churches, sent abroad into all kingdoms, his letters and bulls, with ample promises of the full pardon of sins, and of eternal salvation to such as

“ would purchase the same with money !!! Even when the
“ traffic of Indulgences was checked by the Pontiffs, as being
“ carried on in too gross a manner, no clear account was given
“ in what the abuse consisted. In fine, it was evident, that no
“ reformation could take place through the medium of quali-
“ fying and correcting abuses of this traffic. The system itself
“ was wholly impious, and the right knowledge of justification
“ was the only remedy adequate to the evil. This, therefore,
“ the reader is to look for, as the most capital object of the
“ Reformation: and thus, in the demolition of one of the
“ vilest perversions of superstition, there suddenly arose and
“ revived, in all its infant simplicity, that Apostolical doctrine,
“ in which is contained the great mystery of the Scriptures.

3. “ The state of mankind at that time was peculiarly
“ adapted to the reception of so rich a display of Gospel-
“ grace. God sent a plentiful rain, whereby he did confirm
“ his inheritance, when it was weary. Men were then bound
“ fast in fetters of iron; their whole religion was one enor-
“ mous mass of bondage. Terrors beset them on every side;
“ and the fiction of purgatory was ever teeming with ghosts
“ and apparitions. Persons truly serious (and such there
“ ever were, and will be, because there ever was, and will be,
“ a true Church on earth) were so clouded in their under-
“ standings by the prevailing corruptions of the hierarchy, that
“ they could find no access to God by Jesus Christ. The road
“ of simple faith, grounded on the divine promises, connected
“ always with real humility, and always productive of hearty
“ and grateful obedience, was stopped up with briers and
“ thorns. No certain rest could be afforded to the weary mind,
“ and a state of doubt, of allowed doubt and anxiety, was
“ recommended by the Papal system. What a joyful doctrine
“ then was that of the real Gospel, of remission of sins, through
“ Christ alone received by faith!—a doctrine, which is in-
“ deed to be found every where in the Scriptures; but these
“ were almost unknown among the people at the beginning of
“ the Reformation.

4. "Should the Philosophical sceptic, or the Pharisaical formalist express his surprise, that I should lay so great a stress on the Christian article of Justification, and wonder that any persons should ever be at a loss to discover the way of obtaining true peace of conscience, it may be useful towards satisfying his scruples, to remind such a character of a *Fourth mark of corruption*, which much prevailed in the times previous to the Reformation. This is, the predominance of the Aristotelian philosophy in Europe at that period,—a philosophy, which knew nothing of original sin and native depravity, which allowed nothing to be criminal, but certain external flagitious actions, and which was unacquainted with the idea of any righteousness of grace, imputed to a sinner. How many in this age, who neither know nor value Aristotle, do yet altogether follow his self-righteous notions of religion! These are congenial to our fallen nature, and are incapable, while they prevail in the mind, of administering any cure to Papal bondage, except that which is worse than the disease itself. They tend to lead men into the depths of Atheistic profaneness. But the person whom God raised up particularly at this time to instruct an ignorant world, was most remarkably eminent for self-knowledge. Only characters of this sort are qualified to inform mankind in subjects of the last importance towards the attainment of their eternal happiness. Luther knew himself; and he knew also the Scriptural grounds on which he stood in his controversies with the ecclesiastical rulers. His zeal was disinterested, his courage undaunted. Accordingly, when he had once erected the standard of truth, he continued to uphold it with an unconquerable intrepidity, which merits the gratitude and esteem of all succeeding ages."—Dean Milner's History of the Church, Vol. iv. p. 277 & seq.

In the able summary furnished by RAPIN of the state of the Church in the fifteenth century (see Vol. vi. of Tin-

dal's Translation, p. 454, Edit. 1729), the following observations occur: — “ The Christian Church had never been in “ so deplorable a condition as in the fifteenth century. The “ justice and mercy of God, and the meritorious death of “ Christ, were scarce any longer the object of a Christian's “ faith. But the far greatest part of the people's religion was “ made to consist in pilgrimages, and the worshipping of the “ blessed Virgin, saints, and relics. As for the Clergy, they “ made it their whole business to support themselves in that “ height of grandeur and power they had attained to, several “ centuries since; and to see that no man presumed to offer to “ dispute their immunities. Church-discipline was never more “ remiss. One would have thought that the Clergy looked “ upon their spiritual power and jurisdiction, but only as a “ rampart to secure their temporal privileges. Provided their “ rights were untouched, every one might do what seemed “ good in his own eyes. The authority of the Church was “ become the main point of Religion.

“ The Papal power had increased exceedingly every century, each Pope having endeavoured to enlarge it as much as possible. They were come at length to dispose of all the church preferments in Christendom, and to be the supreme judges in all causes ecclesiastical. National synods were quite out of doors. And, indeed, what use would they have been of, since the Court of Rome claimed the cognizance of all Church matters? In a word, the Pope was become the centre of Religion, to which every thing must needs tend. The privileges of particular Churches, the prerogatives of sovereigns, were all annulled by the Nonobstante clause, which was usually inserted in every Bull. But it was not only over *spirituals*, that the Popes had stretched their authority. They pretended moreover to extend it over *temporals*, under colour that no case could happen but wherein religion was concerned. Kings themselves were not out of their reach. In all the marriages of Princes there was occasion for the Pope's dispensation. Neither

“ peace nor truce of any moment was concluded without the
“ Pope being mediator or guarantee. Some Popes were seen
“ to carry their pretensions so far, as to enjoin peaces or truces
“ without the consent of the parties concerned. In short, it
“ is extremely probable that they would have wholly engross-
“ ed the temporal power as well as the spiritual, if the schisms
“ of the fifteenth century had not caused them to lose a great
“ deal of ground. The revolutions of the following century
“ made them lose still more. Nevertheless the Popes were be-
“ come real Sovereigns, not only with respect to the power
“ they had grasped, but likewise with regard to the immense
“ riches which through numberless channels flowed into the
“ vast ocean of the Apostolie chamber. Tenthys, first-fruits,
“ taxes for the use of the chamber; dispensations for all sorts of
“ matters, as well repugnant to the law of God, as contrary to
“ the canons of the Church; subsidies exacted every now
“ and then from the Clergy, for the occasions of the Holy See;
“ crusadoes; benefices, which were seldom bestowed without a
“ previous bargain with the Apostolic chamber; in a word,
“ simony openly practised by many Popes, some of whom
“ were accused and convicted, were inexhaustible fountains
“ from whence flowed the riches and luxury of the Court of
“ Rome. It was next to impossible, that purity of life and of
“ true religious principle, should keep itself unspotted amidst
“ so much grandeur and affluence. On the contrary, the Popes
“ were so much the more liable to make an ill use of their
“ power, as the generality of them were not born for so high
“ a station. Accordingly we find in history, that Rome and
“ Avignon (the seats of the Popes) were the centre of pride,
“ avarice, luxury, sensuality, and of all the most scandalous
“ vices. The Popes were neither learned nor religious.
“ Hardly was there one to be found that might pass for an
“ honest man, even according to the maxims of the world.
“ And yet all the preambles of their Bulls were stuffed with
“ expressions of their zeal, their charity, their humility, their
“ justice: whilst for the most part what they enjoined, was an

“ authentic proof of their pride and tyranny. I do not in
“ the least aggravate matters. The authors which wrote
“ before the Reformation have said a hundred times more.
“ And the same has been even publicly preached before the
“ Councils.

“ We may easily imagine that such kind of Popes did not
“ take much care to fill what they call the sacred college, with
“ persons truly pious and religious. It is true, indeed, during
“ this century there were Cardinals of great fame, and
“ eminent for their wit, their eloquence, their political virtues,
“ and their capacity for temporal affairs. But they were for
“ the most part worldly-minded men, who considered religion
“ but as a means to make their fortune. The Legates who
“ were sent to the several states of Christendom were so many
“ incendiaries, who made it their business to sow discord and
“ division among Princes, or to spur them on to shed the
“ blood of their own subjects. In a word, they minded no-
“ thing but the interests of their Master and the Roman See,
“ making no conscience to break through all the rules of re-
“ ligion and equity, in order to compass their ends.

“ The rest of the Clergy in general were no better. Most
“ of the Bishops were promoted to the Episcopacy, purely for
“ having shewn themselves sticklers for the court of Rome, or
“ been of service to Princes in their temporal concerns. They
“ were persons brought up at court, and instructed in the
“ maxims of the world. Cruelty, injustice, dishonesty, were
“ but too common among them. These were even deemed as
“ so many virtues, when employed in the persecution of such
“ as they termed Heretics, especially of such as dared to
“ question any of the Pope’s or the Clergy’s pretended rights.

“ As for real learning, it was scarce so much as heard of in
“ this century. School-divinity and skill in the canon-law,
“ were all that Ecclesiastics valued themselves upon. It was
“ the only road by which they could hope to arrive at church
“ dignities. On the other hand, the Monks, who had crept
“ into most of the professorships in the universities, had over-

“ run divinity and philosophy with such a heap of jargon, as
“ served only to give their disciples false notions of learning,
“ and to teach them to wrangle.

“ All Europe passionately wished that the Church might be
“ reformed. Several Bishops seemed to desire the same.
“ Nothing was talked of in the Councils but the necessity of
“ going through with so noble a work. One would have even
“ thought that the Councils of Constance and Basil intended
“ to labour at it to some purpose. But the well-affected had
“ neither prudence nor resolution enough to withstand the
“ artifices and violence of the opposite party. We shall see
“ in the sequel, that it was the Popes, the Cardinals, and the
“ Chiefs of the Clergy, who opposed with all their might the
“ Reformation intended, because they were very sensible that
“ it would prove prejudicial to their temporal concerns. On
“ the other hand, when a man considers with what eagerness
“ and animosity they laboured to root out the pretended he-
“ resies, which combated the worldly grandeur of the Clergy,
“ he can make no other inference from thence, but that they
“ themselves perceived the necessity of a reformation which
“ they would not admit, and that the fountain of the corrup-
“ tion was in the heads of the Church, from whence it had but
“ too great an influence upon the inferior Clergy.”

After giving an account of the schism in the Papacy itself, which began in 1378, and lasted fifty years, through which period there were actually *two* Popes, and at one time *three*, RAPIN proceeds:

“ This abstract, as short as it is, will enable us to guess at
“ the character of the Popes, who were at the head of the
“ Church during these fifty years. They were men who
“ sacrificed the peace and quiet of the Church to their own
“ private interests, and damned without mercy, as far as lay
“ in their power, all that were not of their party. They
“ would without scruple have involved all Christendom in a
“ bloody war upon their score, if the sovereign princes had
“ not been wiser than themselves. Surely a man cannot but

“ form to himself a very melancholy idea of the state of the
“ Church of those days, when he considers that the Christians
“ of both sides acknowledged for Christ’s vicars, Popes whom
“ they detested and abhorred, and who indeed were so little
“ worthy of the station they enjoyed, that several of them
“ were deposed for *heresy, simony, and perjury.*”

After observing upon the Councils of Basil and of Pisa, he remarks upon the Council of Constance:

“ The schisms manifestly tended to the dissolution of
“ the Papal dignity, which served for a basis and foundation
“ to most of the Clergy’s privileges, and to the Hierarchy
“ itself. Castile, Arragon, Navarre, Portugal, had stood
“ neuter some years, without owning any of the contending
“ Popes. France had withdrawn her obedience from Benedict
“ XIII. without transferring it to Gregory XII. In a word,
“ the whole world in general, began to contemn their excom-
“ munications, which they so visibly abused. There was dan-
“ ger, therefore, that people would learn by degrees to do
“ without a Pope: by which means the foundation of the
“ Hierarchy would have been undermined, and perhaps a new
“ form of government introduced into the Church. The
“ Cardinals and Prelates of whom the Council of Constance
“ was composed, were so highly concerned to avoid this in-
“ convenience, that it is no wonder they should sacrifice all to
“ attain their ends. This is the true reason of their conduct.
“ But they took care to proceed in a very different manner,
“ with regard to the pretended Heretics, who openly called the
“ Clergy’s privileges into question. In order to root out a
“ heresy so prejudicial to them, they made use of fire and
“ sword, rather than recede from the least of their interests.

“ All the world knows that JOHN HUSS and JEROME of
“ PRAGUE were burnt alive at Constance; but every body
“ has not been at the pains to examine for what errors they
“ suffered that rigorous punishment. They were then, and
“ still are to this day, charged with having maintained im-
“ pious, horrible, and damnable tenets. They were condemn-

“ ed as seditious, obstinate, and incorrigible followers and de-
“ fenders of Wickliff; hardened, crafty, malicious, and convict-
“ ed Heretics. Had there been any stronger terms to express
“ their horror for these heresies, they would have made no
“ scruple to use them. But, after all, wherein consisted these
“ heresies? In their being followers of Wickliff. If you
“ consult the authors who speak of their sentence, you will
“ scarce find one which says more than that *John Huss* and
“ *Jerome of Prague* were followers of *Wickliff*, and conse-
“ quently abominable wretches, deserving to be condemned to
“ the flames. In the opinions of *Wickliff*, then, we are to
“ search for their errors. Now herein is a double meaning,
“ which has been constantly made use of to justify the sen-
“ tence of these two doctors. It is hardly to be questioned,
“ but that the Council of Constance had that same double
“ meaning in view, when she caused the errors and memory
“ of *Wickliff* to be stigmatized first, before *John Huss* and
“ *Jerome of Prague* were brought upon their trial. *Wickliff's*
“ opinions were of two kinds. The one concerned the main
“ doctrines of faith; the other related to the Hierarchy,
“ the Clergy, their jurisdiction, power, and riches. *Wickliff*
“ did not believe transubstantiation. He rejected the invoca-
“ tion of saints, the adoration of the cross and images, pil-
“ grimages and relics. On the other hand, he thought that
“ the Hierarchy had no foundation in Scripture. From whence
“ he drew several conclusions against the excessive authority
“ which the Popes, the Cardinals, and the Bishops had
“ usurped. Moreover, he taxed the Clergy with leading very
“ immoral and dissolute lives, and maintained that the reve-
“ nues of the Church were exceedingly misused. From these
“ principles his enemies inferred numberless consequences,
“ some whereof had never entered into his thoughts. In a
“ word, they came to find in his writings two hundred and
“ sixty capital errors. His followers added a great many
“ more, which he had never taught, and the whole sum was

“ imputed to him, as if he had maintained them all in express terms.

“ However it be, *John Huss* embraced *Wickliff*’s opinions, but it was only in what concerned the Hierarchy and Clergy. It is certain he believed transubstantiation, and died in that belief. As for images, his opinion was, that a man might honor them, kneel to them, light up wax-tapers before them, kiss them, because the mind referred that worship to the originals. So that it is a thing past dispute, that he was not burnt for maintaining errors in the main doctrines of faith, but for opinions which combated the exorbitant power and riches of the Church, that is to say, of the Clergy. All possible endeavours were used to make him deny transubstantiation. But he never could be brought to that. And yet by the advice of the Cardinal of Florence, the Council condemned him upon the deposition of the witnesses that accused him of rejecting that doctrine, without having any regard to his own express declaration to the contrary. It is no hard matter to conceive the Council’s drift, in causing that article to be inserted in *Huss*’s Sentence. The Council was very sensible that it must needs have appeared very strange, that a person should be condemned to be burnt, whose principles tended to a reformation, as well in the head, as in the members of the Church, which all Christendom required, and which the Council itself feigned to believe necessary. It was requisite, therefore, to justify the sentence, by rendering this man odious, as one that rejected a fundamental article of faith. For this reason, without distinguishing *Wickliff*’s errors, *John Huss* and *Jerome of Prague* were condemned as followers of that Arch-Heretic. Whereby it was intimated that they embraced all the opinions of their master.

“ But to make it appear, by a testimony beyond all exception, that these two men were burnt for their notions concerning the Clergy, I need only quote what *Aeneas Sylvius*, alias Pope Pius II. says in his History of Bohemia. ‘ The

“ Deputies of the Council having admonished the parties accused to forsake their errors, and conform to the Church’s sentiments, they made answer, that they were indeed lovers of the holy Gospel, and true disciples of Christ: that the Church of Rome, and all the other Churches in the world, were far gone from the Apostolical traditions: that the Clergy ran after pleasures and riches; that they lorded it over the people, affected the highest seats at entertainments, and bred horses and dogs: that the revenues of the Church, which belonged to the poor members of Christ, were consumed in vanity and wantonness: that the Priests were ignorant of the commandments of God, or, if they did know them, they lightly regarded them.

“ The Fathers of the Council” (continues the Historian), “ perceiving and knowing the invincible obstinacy of these people, judged that the corrupted members of the Church that were incurable, ought to be cut off, lest they should infect the rest of the body. Accordingly sentence was passed upon them, all the Fathers unanimously agreeing that persons who rejected sound doctrine, approved of by the Church, deserved to be burnt.’

“ Hence it is evident to a demonstration, wherein consisted the heresy of *John Huss* and of *Jerome of Prague*, viz: in their accusing the Clergy of being corrupted. It was then in order to destroy these enemies of the Clergy, that the Council made no scruple to violate the safe-conduct the Emperor Sigismund had given *John Huss*, or at least to allow that he should violate it himself. Moreover, the Council had no regard to the promise they had publicly given to *Jerome of Prague*, in order to draw him to Constance. It is true indeed, the Council had inserted these words in their engagement, ‘without prejudice to justice, and as far as the Catholic faith requires it:’ but was not the Catholic faith the very point in question? and of what use could the Council’s promise be to *Jerome of Prague*, unless against justice? Did he run any risk, or stand in need of a promise of safety,

“ if he had not held the tenets he was charged with? As to
“ other opinions which appeared at the same time, but which
“ struck not at the Clergy, the Council of Constance behaved
“ with an astonishing coldness. *John Petit*, advocate of the
“ Duke of Burgundy, had maintained that it was lawful for
“ any private person to kill a tyrant, even by surprise. This
“ tenet being brought before the Council, what was done
“ in the matter? After abundance of solicitations, they de-
“ clared it erroneous, without naming the author, or coming
“ upon his person, though they had ordered *Wickliff*’s bones
“ to be dug up thirty years after he was buried. The Sect of
“ the Scourgers broached several erroneous doctrines. But the
“ Council was content with proposing that a way should be
“ found out to bring them back by fair means to the unity of
“ the Church. What reformation could be expected from a
“ Council which prosecuted so rigorously such as called in
“ question the privileges of the Pope, the Cardinals, and the
“ Clergy? The Reformation must have begun with lopping
“ off the chief branches of these prerogatives. Indeed, before
“ Martin V.’s election, the reforming the Court of Rome was
“ talked of in the Council; and a list of the abuses which
“ were to be redressed, was drawn up. But by the artifices of
“ some, and especially of the Cardinals, this noble design
“ came to nothing. A Pope was elected, and the Pope elect
“ found means to get this matter put off to a more convenient
“ season.”

This is followed by an interesting account of the Council of Basil’s proceedings against the Hussites, which were greatly inflamed by Pope Martin V.; and RAPIN then observes: “ It follows, that war was made upon them purely
“ for the sake of maintaining the Church’s authority. That
“ was the main point of religion. But for what reason were
“ they persecuted afterwards? It was because the Popes
“ would never stand to their agreement, though the Hussites
“ frequently offered to submit to the Church upon that con-
“ dition. It is evident then, that the war from the beginning

“ to the end was wholly founded upon this principle, that the
“ Church has a despotic power, and that it is unlawful to
“ bind her to any condition. But what Church is this that is
“ invested with so high a prerogative? It cannot be a general
“ Council, since such a Council has not judged that point
“ unquestionable. It is, therefore, the Pope alone which must
“ be meant by the Church. It will be said perhaps, that the
“ authority of the Council of Basil is not acknowledged by a
“ great part of the Church: but this will be without ground.
“ For the truth is, the agreement with the Hussites was made
“ before the Council was removed to Ferrara, and that of Basil
“ is owned by all the world for lawful before that removal.

“ Till the Council of Basil, the Popes and the Councils
“ had agreed pretty well to improve the Church’s authority,
“ and cause it to be absolutely obeyed. By the help of the
“ equivocal word CHURCH, an entire submission was required
“ of Christians, sometimes to the Pope as the head, sometimes
“ to the Councils as representatives of the body, according as
“ an opportunity offered to make the best of that term, for the
“ benefit of the one or the other. As for the Christian Laity,
“ they had been reckoned long ago to have no share in the
“ meaning of the word CHURCH. But, however, though in
“ confining the signification of the word CHURCH to the
“ Clergy alone, there still remained some ambiguity, it had not
“ yet entered into any one’s head to remove it by deciding
“ whether the authority of the Church was lodged in the body
“ of the Clergy, or in the Pope as head.

“ From the time that the last schism was closed, to the
“ end of the fifteenth century, the Papal chair was filled
“ with Popes cruelly bent upon the destruction of the Hus-
“ sites, contrary to the faith of the agreement, or wholly
“ taken up with asserting the exorbitant power usurped by
“ their predecessors, and generally in order to have an oppor-
“ tunity to satisfy their avarice.

“ CALIXTUS III. successor of NICHOLAS V. oppressed the
“ Germans to such a degree, that they were forced at length

“ to break the agreement they had made with Eugenius IV.
 “ plainly perceiving it was of no manner of use.

“ PIUS II. who was lately canonized, was so far from
 “ consenting to a Reformation in the head of the Church,
 “ that he excommunicated by a Bull all persons that should
 “ dare to appeal from the Pope to a General Council.

“ PAUL II. was no sooner chosen, but he broke the oath
 “ he had taken before his election, concerning the redressing
 “ certain abuses which himself, with the rest of the Cardinals,
 “ had judged necessary. Never were the *Gratiæ Expectivæ*
 “ (or Bulls for Church-preferments before they become void)
 “ more frequent than whilst he sat in the Papal chair. He
 “ spent the whole time of his Pontificate in striving to abolish
 “ the Pragmatic Sanction * in France, which debarred him of
 “ the liberty of doing there whatever he pleased.

“ SIXTUS IV. raised, by one of his Bulls, the Hierarchy to
 “ the greatest height possible, just when thousands were com-
 “ plaining of the excessive power the Clergy had usurped.

“ INNOCENT VIII. picked a quarrel with Ferdinand of
 “ Arragon, King of Naples, and, by his solicitations, inclined
 “ Charles VIII. to carry his arms into Italy.

“ ALEXANDER VI. was one of the vilest men of his age.
 “ This is he of whom a famous Roman Catholic writer
 “ (MEZERAI) gives this fine character; that he would have
 “ been the wickedest man in the world, if he had not had a
 “ bastard son (CÆSAR BORGIA), who was more wicked than
 “ himself.

“ I pass over in silence the blood-thirstiness of all these
 “ Popes, in persecuting the Bohemians, contrary to the faith
 “ of their agreement. The Crusadoes against the Turks, in

* “ This was an Edict, passed in the Council of Bourges, in the
 “ reign of Charles VII. and was levelled against Papal provisions, the
 “ payment of first-fruits, and other encroachments of the Court of
 “ Rome. In a word, it contains the privileges of the Gallican Church,
 “ and was taken out of the Acts of the Council of Constance and
 “ Basil.”

“ which they would have engaged all the Princes of Europe,
“ appeared very specious: but Sovereigns were so well sa-
“ tisfied, that, in publishing Crusadoes, the Popes had no-
“ thing in view but their own private interest, that they
“ could never have any confidence in them.

“ Such, in general, was the state of the Christian Church
“ in the Fifteenth century, upon which I shall make but
“ one single remark, leaving my readers at liberty to make as
“ many as they please: what I would observe is, that the ab-
“ stract I have just given makes it evident to a demonstration
“ how trifling their opinion is, who say that it is not the bu-
“ siness of private persons, to endeavour to reform the
“ Church, but that the work must be left to the Church
“ herself. Who then is this Church, from which we are
“ to expect this happy Reformation? Is it all Christians in
“ general, agreeing together as it were by a sudden inspiration
“ to reform abuses? Doubtless this is not what is meant by
“ the word Church. Is it the Pope with his Cardinals? But
“ these are the very men who have all along prevented it;
“ and very probably will do so for ever to the utmost of their
“ power. Shall a General Council take in hand this reforma-
“ tion? But what has passed hitherto in these assemblies af-
“ fords no prospect of receiving so great a benefit from thence.
“ Besides, who shall call this General Council?—Of whom
“ shall it be composed? Who shall preside in it? Can the
“ Pope be brought to convene a General Council, on purpose
“ to reform the Church? Will he give the Presidentship to
“ another, that the members may, with the more freedom,
“ reform him with his Court? In a word, shall it be the
“ Pope, the Cardinals, the Prelates, that shall determine
“ matters in this Council? But, these are so many parties
“ concerned to leave things just as they are.

“ Will it be said with some, that the Church has no need
“ of reformation: that she is innocent and pure, without spot
“ or wrinkle, or any such thing: that all the prerogatives
“ which the Popes, the Cardinals, the Bishops enjoy, belong

“ to them by Divine right: that the Pope exercises no power
 “ but what Christ invested him with: that his decisions are
 “ infallible, as well in point of fact as of right, and that the
 “ same obedience must be paid to his decrees as to those of
 “ God himself? But if by ill-luck it falls out, that, pur-
 “ suant to this principle, the Popes should enlarge their phy-
 “ lacteries, and every day form new claims, as it has but too
 “ frequently happened, how shall one be able to set bounds
 “ to them, if it is confessed that the Church has no need of
 “ reformation, or that the business of reformation must be
 “ left to the Church herself?

“ After having taken a view of the state of the Church in
 “ general, it is time to come to that of the Church of England
 “ in particular. England, with regard to Religion, was just in
 “ the same state with the rest of Europe. The people were
 “ extremely desirous of a reformation of sundry abuses which
 “ had crept into the Church. The Clergy were tooth and
 “ nail against it, because no change could be made but to
 “ their prejudice. As for the Kings, they made Religion
 “ subservient to their interest. When they imagined they
 “ stood in need of the Clergy, they found ways and means
 “ enough to evade the people’s demands; but when the Par-
 “ liament’s good will was requisite, they assented to such
 “ statutes as served to curb the encroachments of the Pope
 “ and Clergy.

“ As for THE ENGLISH NATION, it is certain it was gene-
 “ rally Wickliffite in some respects. WICKLIFF’s opinions
 “ tended manifestly to these two main ends: first, to reform
 “ the government of the Church, and to set bounds to the
 “ power of the Pope and Clergy; secondly, to alter the
 “ Church’s Creed as to certain doctrines long since received,
 “ and which he thought contrary to Scripture. Now, as he
 “ perceived that it was next to impossible that Christians
 “ should be brought back to what he believed to be the ancient
 “ faith of the Church; because the Clergy were concerned to
 “ maintain the established errors, he insisted stoutly upon

“ the first point, as being absolutely necessary in order to
“ be able to attain to the second. It is certain that in respect
“ to the general aim he proposed to himself in the first of
“ these points, not only his professed followers, but all the
“ rest of the people, did, as it were, join with him. For
“ many ages the English had felt the oppression which the
“ Pope and Clergy had kept them under. *In all Chris-
“ tedom there was no people that had experienced more the
“ rigour of the Church's dominion: THE HISTORY OF EN-
“ GLAND MAKES THIS APPEAR SO VISIBLY, THAT A MAN MUST
“ HAVE BEEN BLIND NOT TO SEE IT.* But granting that
“ history has carried matters too far in this respect, the Sta-
“ tutes of Provisors and Premunire, so frequently revived,
“ leave no room to question but that the English thought
“ themselves oppressed.

“ In spite of all the complaints which the English had
“ frequently carried to the Court of Rome, about her conti-
“ nual encroachments, and in spite of the precautions which
“ several Parliaments had taken to screen themselves from her
“ usurpations, the Popes did not abate an inch of their pre-
“ tensions. The Acts of Parliament were to them but like
“ cannon without ball, which made a noise without any effect.
“ Upon every occasion that offered, they made no scruple to
“ act contrary to these Statutes, as if there had been no such
“ thing; and to assert their Apostolic power without troubling
“ themselves whether they prejudiced the King or his sub-
“ jects. The Parliament, willing to remedy the abuses which
“ arose from the continual dispensations granted by the Pope
“ without hearing the cause, passed an Act that all persons
“ who purchased or executed any Bulls to be discharged from
“ the payment of tithes, should incur the penalties contained
“ in the Statute of Provisors. It was enacted by another
“ Statute, passed at the same time, that if any person should
“ procure a provision to be exempt of the jurisdiction of the
“ Bishops, he should incur the same penalties. These Acts
“ being made chiefly with a view to the Monks, were not ca-

“ pable of producing the intended effect, because the Pope, “ by the fulness of his Apostolic authority, exempted the “ Monks from the observance of these parliamentary Statutes. “ The Bishops, whom this affair chiefly concerned, not daring “ to dispute the power which the Pope assumed, it was the “ Parliament’s business to stand up for their cause, as well as “ their own. To that purpose the Statutes upon this subject “ were revived, and a clause added, prohibiting the Monks “ in particular to purchase or execute any such exemptions, “ upon the penalty comprised in the Statute of Premunire.

“ The Statute of Premunire, which I have mentioned “ upon several occasions, was a terrible fence against the en- “ croachments of the Court of Rome. It is true, that it did “ not fall upon the Pope directly, since the Parliament had “ no power over him. But as it hindered the English from “ applying to the Court of Rome for things contrary to the “ prerogatives of the crown and the laws of the realm, it “ abridged the Pope of a good part of the advantages which “ he pretended to by his Apostolic power. It will seem “ strange, perhaps, that the Popes should be silent when this “ Statute was passed, and a good while after. But it is easy “ to find out the reason. The schism which began in 1378, “ and lasted till 1409, hindered them from bestirring them- “ selves. The Popes which England acknowledged took care “ to give no cause of offence at such a juncture.

“ MARTIN V. considered not this business with the same “ indifference. In 1426 he wrote a thundering letter to “ Chicheley, Archbishop of Canterbury, upbraiding him for “ his remissness in this particular, and enjoining him to exert “ his utmost to get the Statute repealed. HENRY VI. who “ was then on the throne, not being above five years old, the “ Pope thought it a proper time to compass his ends.”

RAPIN then gives large extracts from the Letter, which are particularly important, and proceeds to inform us, that the Archbishop and his Clergy used great exertions to induce the House of Commons to repeal the Statute; going there

in person, and making a speech on the occasion; but they very wisely refused to comply; and RAPIN then observes: “ POPE “ MARTIN’s letter, and his extraordinary endeavours to get the “ Statute of Premunire repealed, shew to a demonstration, “ that *the main of Religion was made then to consist in the Pope’s prerogatives, and the Clergy’s immunities.* Hence “ it appears farther, how averse MARTIN was to consent to “ the least diminution of his pretended rights, and conse- “ quently to a reformation in the head and members of the “ Church, demanded with so much earnestness at the Council “ of Constance, where he was present in person. Before I “ leave the Statute of Premunire, it will not be improper to “ observe, that this Act had two principal clauses. The first, “ which contained the Statute of Provisors made in the reign “ of Edward I. prohibited the soliciting and procuring of “ Benefices from the Court of Rome, by way of provision, “ contrary to the rights of the Crown and the Patrons. The “ second prohibited the carrying to the Court of Rome, or “ elsewhere, causes which belong to the King’s Courts.

“ Besides the contests which the Statute of Premunire “ caused between England and the Court of Rome, there were “ some others which I shall but just touch upon. In 1403, “ in the reign of HENRY IV. the Parliament passed an Act, “ forbidding all persons that should have provision of any be- “ nefice, to pay into the Apostolic Chamber more than was “ paid in old time. The penalty for those that did the contrary “ was, that they should forfeit to the King the same sum “ they paid the Pope. The occasion of this Statute was a “ grievance introduced some time since by the Court of Rome, “ which was, that no person should have provision of any “ Benefice that was void, till he had compounded with the “ Apostolic Chamber, as well for the first fruits, as for other “ lesser services in that Court, and had paid beforehand the “ sum agreed upon.

“ But the greatest dispute between England and the “ Popes was upon the score of the collation of the Bishopries,

“ Though the Popes, when the first Anglo-Saxons were converted, had sent Italian or other foreign Bishops into England, it is certain that towards the latter end of the Saxon monarchy, the Bishops were chosen by the Chapters. The same privilege was continued to them after the Norman conquest, and confirmed by King John’s Charter. Meanwhile the Popes, having gradually enlarged their authority, assumed the power of bestowing Archbishoprics and Bishoprics, by way of provision, sometimes on one, sometimes on another pretence. This is what I have had frequent occasion to remark in this History. They would fain have established this rule at once, that the disposal of all the Bishoprics belonged to them by divine right, but as they found it something difficult, they bethought themselves of another expedient; and that was, to get possession by degrees, that they might in time find a right upon precedent. Thus, being content at first with maintaining that, upon certain occasions, they had a power to fill the vacant sees, they afterwards framed these occasions when they pleased. In short, they multiplied them so very fast, that hardly was there a vacant Bishopric which they did not fill by way of provision. Time and lucky junctures having confirmed them in this prerogative, there was no longer any possibility to wrench it out of their clutches. Thus the privilege of the Chapters was entirely destroyed.

“ MARTIN V, was no sooner seated in the Papal chair, but he boldly disposed of all the Sees which became void, without any regard to the privilege of the Chapters. In two years only, he filled by way of provision thirteen Bishoprics in the province of Canterbury. It was not only with respect to Sees that England had cause to complain of the Pope; he disposed, likewise, of all the other benefices of the kingdom, without giving himself any trouble, either about the right of the patrons, or the instruction of the people. *The best preferments were for the most part conferred upon foreigners, who understood not a word of*

“ *English, or resided not in England, and sometimes upon Children themselves.* For instance, he made PROSPER CO-“ LONNA, his nephew, *then not above fourteen years old*, Arch-“ deacon of Canterbury. HENRY V. who was a Prince of a very “ high spirit, sent Ambassadors to Rome to complain as well “ of these as other grievances. But MARTIN V. delayed “ giving an answer so long, that the Ambassadors told him, “ the King their master had chose to send them to Rome, “ purely out of a deference to the Holy See, to which he was “ not obliged; but that for the future he would use his “ prerogative: that in the mean time they had instructions to “ make a solemn protestation before himself and the Con-“ clave, if his Holiness would not comply immediately. I “ know not what answer the Pope returned. But not long “ after, MARTIN having translated the Bishop of Lincoln to “ the See of York, by way of provision, the Chapter refused “ to admit him, and the Pope was forced to revoke his “ Bull.

“ In 1438 the University of Oxford complained that “ *Church Preferments were bestowed without any regard to learning or merit*; that therefore the Colleges were be-“ come empty, because there was no need of study or learning “ to qualify a man for a Benefice. Whereupon the Convoca-“ tion, to whom this complaint was addressed, passed a canon, “ that none but Graduates in the University should be capable “ of benefices. But this was a weak fence against the Papal “ power.

“ Meanwhile, though the Court of Rome made the Apo-“ stolic authority sound very high, yet the Popes now and “ then met with some mortifications. For example, in the “ reign of HENRY IV. the Parliament ordered that the Peter-“ pence should be deposited in the King’s hands till the schism “ was closed.

“ In the reign of HENRY V. the Alien Priories were sup-“ pressed, without asking the Pope’s consent.

“ Under HENRY VI. Pope NICHOLAS V. having demanded

“ an extraordinary subsidy of the Clergy of England, for the
“ occasions of the Holy See, the King forbade the Clergy to
“ grant it.

“ The like demand, made some years after by one VICENTINI
“ a Nuncio, was bluntly denied by the Clergy. They began
“ to stand less in fear of the Papal power, formerly so dread-
“ ful to the whole Church, and particularly to England.

“ During the whole fifteenth century we do not find that
“ any National Councils were held in England, but only con-
“ vocations of the Clergy in the two Ecclesiastical Provinces
“ of Canterbury and York. **THE CONDEMNATION OF THE**
“ **LOLLARDS** (or Protestants) **WAS ALMOST THE WHOLE BUSI-**
“ **NESS OF THESE CONVOCATIONS.** As for National Synods,
“ they were become useless, since the Popes had engrossed the
“ cognizance of all Ecclesiastical matters. Besides, the least
“ appeal to the Pope was enough to make void all the
“ Canons of a Council. On the other hand, the Popes had
“ managed it so that no National Synods could be held without
“ their license. Now, as in these Synods there was but too
“ frequent occasion to examine into the bounds of the Papal
“ authority, they were grown so odious to the Court of Rome,
“ that the use of them was laid aside by degrees. At this
“ very day, in the States which have not admitted of a Reform-
“ ation, we hear no more of National Councils, or at least
“ so very rarely, that it is plain the Popes do not allow them
“ but with regret and much difficulty. Of this we have seen
“ of late years a remarkable instance in France, in what
“ passed about the famous Constitution **UNIGENITUS** of CLE-
“ MENT XI.; LEWIS XIV. as powerful and formidable as he
“ was, could never obtain the Pope’s leave to call a National
“ Council, but upon such terms as rendered the thing im-
“ practicable, though that Monarch’s sole aim in it was to get
“ the Constitution approved.”

The above able summary of RAPIN affords a proper introduction to the *History of the Reformation in England*, by BURNET, a work of the first authority and the highest value; and

one which it were well that certain English Protestants would make themselves acquainted with, before they begin to defend the REVIVAL OF THE ORDER OF JESUITS, or to contend for the granting of what is absurdly termed CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION. They might then perhaps come to know something more of the Religion which they profess, and to entertain more correct notions of the Religion which they would arm with temporal power, and clothe with the functions of legislation in a Protestant State.

BURNET's *Abridgment of his History* by himself will be found an invaluable compendium; and the following passages in it will give an accurate idea of the want of a Reformation here and elsewhere :

1st, His account of POPE CLEMENT VII.'s creation of Fourteen Cardinals *for money* in 1527, which, however, he says "may perhaps be excused from SIMONY, because they "took no care of Souls."—Burnet's Abridgment, p. 6.

2d, His account of the ambition and profligacy of CARDINAL WOLSEY, who was first made Bishop of Tournay, then of Lincoln, afterwards of York, and had both the Abbey of St. Alban's, and the Bishopric of Bath and Wells in commendam; the last of which, he exchanged for Durham, and then quitted Durham for Winchester. "Besides all this" (says BURNET), "the King by a special grant gave him power to "dispose of all the Ecclesiastical preferments in England, so that "in effect *he was the Pope of this other world*, and he copied "skilfully enough after those patterns which were set him at "Rome. He had, in one word, all the qualities necessary for "a great minister, and all the vices ordinary in a great fa- "vourite."—Burnet further informs us, that when 800,000l. was wanted from Parliament, this legitimate representative of the Papacy went to the House of Commons, and desired to hear the reasons of those who were against the supply; but he was told by the Speaker that it was against their orders to speak to a debate before one who was not of the House—(see Burnet's Abridgment, p. 10); in which discharge of his

duty he was a worthy predecessor of the celebrated LENTHALL, who when King Charles I. demanded that the four Members should be delivered up, who had expressed themselves with freedom respecting the disuse of Parliaments, and the introduction of Popery and despotism, had the courage to tell that misguided and unfortunate monarch, that he had neither ears to hear, nor eyes to see, nor a tongue to utter any thing, but what that House should command.

3d, BURNET's account of the Abbot of Winchelcomb, who contended, both in his Sermons and in a printed work, that all the Clergy even of the lower orders were sacred, and could not be judged by the temporal Courts, whatever crimes they might commit, whether murder, theft, or otherwise; a point which he carried, though against the sense of all the enlightened part of the nation.

4th, BURNET's account of the murder of HUN in prison by the Popish Clergy, where he had been placed for HERESY, that is, *for having in his possession Wickliff's Bible*.—See Burnet's Abridgment, p. 16.

5th, BURNET's account of WICKLIFF's opposition to Popery, and of some of the corruptions of that religion, which will be best given in his own words:—

“ From the days of WICKLIFF, there were many that differed from the doctrines commonly received. He wrote many books that gave great offence to the Clergy, yet being powerfully supported by the DUKE OF LANCASTER, they could not have their revenge during his life; but he was after his death condemned, and his body was raised and burnt. The Bible which he translated into English, with the Preface which he set before it, produced the greatest effects. In it he reflected on the ill lives of the Clergy, and condemned the worship of Saints and Images, and the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament: but the most criminal part was, *the exhorting all people to read the Scriptures*; where the testimonies against those corruptions were such, that there was no way to deal with them but to silence

“ them. His followers were not men of letters, but being
“ wrought on by the easy conviction of plain sense, were by
“ them determined in their persuasions. They did not form
“ themselves into a body, but were contented to hold their
“ opinions secretly, and did not spread them, but to their par-
“ ticular confidants. The Clergy sought them out every
“ where, and did deliver them after conviction to the secular
“ arm, that is, to the fire.”—Burnet’s Abridgment, book i. p.
23.—Again:

“ In the beginning of this reign there were several per-
“ sons brought into the Bishops’ Courts for Heresy, before
“ WARHAM. Forty-eight were accused: but of these, forty-
“ three abjured, twenty-seven men, and sixteen women, most
“ of them being of Tenterden; and five of them, four men
“ and one woman, were condemned; some as obstinate He-
“ retics, and others as Relapses: and against the common ties of
“ nature, the woman’s husband, and her two sons, were brought
“ witnesses against her. Upon their conviction, a certificate
“ was made by the Archbishop to the Chancery; upon which,
“ since there is no pardon upon record, the writs for burning
“ them must have gone out in course, and the execution of
“ them is little to be doubted: for the Clergy were seldom
“ guilty of much mercy in such cases, having divested them-
“ selves of all bowels as the dregs of unmortified nature. The
“ articles objected to them were, that they believed that in the
“ Eucharist there was nothing but material bread; that the
“ Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, Confession, Matri-
“ mony, and Extreme Unction, were neither necessary, nor
“ profitable: that Priests had no more power than Laymen:
“ that Pilgrimages were not meritorious, and that the money
“ and labour spent in them, were spent in vain; that images
“ ought not to be worshipped, and that they were only stocks
“ and stones: that prayers ought not to be made to Saints,
“ but only to God: that there was no virtue in Holy-water,
“ or Holy-bread. Those who abjured, did swear to discover
“ all that held those errors, or were suspected of them; and

“ they were enjoined to carry a faggot in procession, and to
 “ wear on their clothes the representation of one in flames,
 “ as a public confession that they had deserved to be burnt.
 “ There were also four in London that abjured the same
 “ opinions ; and Fox says, that six were burnt in Smithfield,
 “ who might be perhaps those whom WARHAM had con-
 “ demned ; for there is no mention of any that were condemned
 “ in the Registers of London. By all this it will appear, that
 “ many in this nation were prepared to receive those doc-
 “ trines which were afterwards preached by the Reformers,
 “ even before LUTHER began first to oppose Indulgences.

“ The rise and progress of this doctrine are well known :
 “ the scandalous extolling of Indulgences gave the first occa-
 “ sion to all that contradiction that followed between him and
 “ his followers, and the Church of Rome ; in which if the
 “ corruptions and cruelties of the Clergy had not been so visible
 “ and scandalous, so small a matter could not have produced
 “ such a revolution ; but any crisis will put ill humours in fer-
 “ mentation.

“ The Bishops were grossly ignorant ; they seldom re-
 “ sided in their dioceses, except it had been to riot it at high
 “ festivals ; and all the effect their residence could have, was
 “ to corrupt others, by their ill example. They followed the
 “ Courts of Princes, and aspired to the greatest offices. The
 “ Abbots and Monks were wholly given up to luxury and
 “ idleness : and the unmarried state, both of the seculars and
 “ regulars, gave infinite scandal to the world ; for it appeared,
 “ that the restraining them from having wives of their own,
 “ made them conclude that they had a right to all other
 “ men’s*. The inferior Clergy were no better ; and not

* GROSE has published, in his Preface to his *ANTIQUITIES OF ENGLAND AND WALES*, two Letters addressed by DOCTOR LAYTON and another (two of the visitors of the Religious Houses) to CROMWELL, in or about the year 1537 ; the originals of which are preserved, together with many others, in the Bodleian Library. They are as follows : — “ Pleas-
 “ ith it your Worship to understand, that we came from GLASTON-
 “ BURY to BRISTOW : I here send you for relics two flowers that on

“ having places of retreat to conceal their vices in, as the
“ Monks had, they became more public. In sum, all ranks of

“ Christmas even will spring and bear flowers. Ye shall also receive a
“ bag of relics, wherein ye shall see strange things, as God’s coat, our
“ Lady’s smock, part of God’s supper, and part of the stone on which
“ Christ was born in Bethlehem; belike Bethlehem affords plenty of
“ stone. These are all of MAIDEN BRADLEY, whereof is a Holy Fa-
“ ther Priour, who hath but six children, and but one daughter married
“ yet of the goods of the Monastery, but trusting shortlie to marrie the
“ rest: his sons be tall men waiting upon him. He thanks God he
“ never meddled with married women: but all with maidens, the fairest
“ that could be gotten, and always married them right well. The Pope,
“ considering his fragilitie, gave him licence to keep a ——; and he has
“ good writing under seal to discharge his conscience, and to chuse Mr.
“ Underhill to be his ghostly father, and he to give him plenary absolu-
“ tion. I send you also our Lady’s girdle of BRUTON, a solemn relic,
“ sent to women in travail; Mary Magdalen’s girdle, which Matilda
“ the Empress, founder of FAIRLEY, gave with them, as sayeth the
“ Holy Father of FAIRLEY. I have crosses of silver and gold, Sir,
“ which I send you not now; because I have more to be delivered this
“ night by the Priour of MAIDEN BRADLEY. There is nothing notable,
“ the Brethren be kept so streight, that they cannot offend; but fain
“ they would if they might, as they confesss, and such fault is not in-
“ them. (Signed) “ R. LAYTON.”

“ From St. Austins, without Bristol.”

“ My singular good Lord, &c. As touching the Abbot of Bury,
“ nothing suspect as touching his living; but it was detected he lay
“ much forth at Grainges, and he spent much money in playing at
“ cards and dice.—It is confessed and proved, that there was here such
“ frequency of women comyng and resortyng as to no place more.—
“ Among the relics are found the coals St. Laurence was roasted withal;
“ the paring of St. Edmund’s nails; St. Thomas of Canterbury’s pen-
“ knife and books; and divers sculls for the head-ach; pieces of the
“ Holy Cross, able to make a whole cross: other relicks, for rain, and
“ for avoiding the weeds growing in corn, &c.

“ From Bury St. Edmund’s. “ Your servant bounden,
“ (Signed) “ JOSEPH RICE.”

See Preface to Grose’s Antiquities, p. 99.

Again—GROSE observes, “ the luxurious manner of living of the
“ Monks, so early as the reign of Henry II. may be gathered from the
“ following stories related of those of Canterbury and Winchester by

“ Churchmen were so universally despised and hated, that the
“ world was very apt to be possessed with prejudice against
“ their doctrines, for the sake of the men, whose interest it
“ was to support them: and the worship of God was so de-
“ filed with much gross superstition, that, without great in-
“ quiries, all men were easily convinced, that the Church stood
“ in great need of a Reformation. This was much increased
“ when the books of the Fathers began to be read, in which
“ the difference between the former and latter ages of the
“ Church did very evidently appear. They found that a
“ blind superstition came first in the room of true piety; and
“ when by its means the wealth and interest of the Clergy
“ was highly advanced, the Popes had, upon that, established
“ their tyranny; under which, not only the meaner people,
“ but even crowned heads, had long groaned. All these
“ things concurred to make way for the advancement of the
“ Reformation. And so the books of the Germans being
“ brought into England, and translated, many were prevailed
“ on by them. Upon this a hot persecution, which is always

“ **GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS**: ‘Their table,’ says he, speaking of the
“ first, ‘consisted regularly of sixteen covers, or more, of the most costly
“ dainties, dressed with the most exquisite cookery to provoke the ap-
“ petite, and please the taste: they had an excessive abundance of
“ wine, particularly claret; of mulberry-wine, of mead, and of other
“ strong liquors; the variety of which was so great in these repasts,
“ that no place could be found for ale, though the best was made in
“ England, and particularly in Kent.’ And of the Prior and Monks of
“ St. Swithin, at Winchester, he says, they threw themselves prostrate
“ at the feet of King Henry II. and with many tears complained to him,
“ that the Bishop of that Diocese, to whom they were subject, as their
“ Abbot, had withdrawn from them three of the usual number of their
“ dishes: Henry inquired of them how many there still remained; and
“ being informed they had ten, he said, he himself was contented with
“ three, and impetrated a curse on the Bishop if he did not reduce
“ them to that number.”—Preface to Grose’s Antiquities, p. 103.

See also in the Cotton Library in the British Museum (Cleopatra,
E. 4), a whole volume of original papers and letters relating to Monas-
teries and their vices, during the reign of King Henry VIII.

“ the foundation on which a vicious Clergy set up their rest, “ was vigorously set on foot,—to such a degree, that six men “ and women were burnt at Coventry in Passion-week, *only* “ *for teaching their children, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments in English.* Great numbers “ were every where brought into the Bishops' Courts, of whom “ some were burnt, but the greater part abjured.

“ 'The King' (Henry VIII.) “ laid hold of this occasion, “ to become the Church's champion, and wrote against LU- “ THER; his Book, besides the title of 'Defender of the “ Faith,' drew upon him all that flattery could invent to extol “ it; yet LUTHER, not daunted with such an antagonist, but “ rather proud of it, answered it, and treated him as much “ below the respect that was due to a King, as his flatterers “ had raised him above it. TINDAL's Translation of the New “ Testament, with some Notes added to it, drew a severe con- “ demnation from the Clergy, *there being nothing in which* “ *they were more concerned, than to keep the people unac-* “ *quainted with that book.*”—BURNET's Abridgment, book i. p. 24 et seq.

6th, BURNET's account of Wolsey's intrigues for the Papal diadem. “ At this time” (says he) “ the Pope was taken sud- “ denly ill, upon which the Imperialists began to prepare for “ a Conclave. But FARNSEY and the CARDINAL OF MANTUA “ opposed them, and seemed to have inclination for WOLSEY, “ whom, as his Correspondents wrote to him, they reverenced “ *as a Deity*; upon this he (Wolsey) sent a courier to GAR- “ DINER then on his way to Rome, with large directions how “ to manage the election. It was reckoned that the King of “ France joining heartily with the King of England, of which “ he seemed confident, there were only six Cardinals wanting “ to make the election sure; and besides sums of money and “ other rewards that were to be distributed among them, he “ was to give them assurance that the Cardinal's (Wolsey's) “ preferments should be divided among them. These were the “ secret methods of attaining that Chair: and indeed it would

" puzzle a man of an ordinary degree of credulity to think that
 " one chosen by such means could be CHRIST'S VICAR, and
 " THE INFALLIBLE JUDGE OF CONTROVERSY." — Burnet's
 Abridgment, book i. p. 45.

7th, BURNET's account of the opposition between the Parliament and the Popish Clergy, as thus stated by him: " The Commons prepared several Bills against some of the corruptions of the Clergy; particularly against plurality of benefices, and non-residence; abuses that even Popery itself could not but condemn. The Clergy abhorred the precedent of the Commons meddling in Ecclesiastical matters: so FISHER spoke vehemently against them, and said, all this flowed from lack of faith; upon which the Commons complained of him to the King for reproaching them." — *Ibid.* p. 56.

8th, BURNET's account of the early encroachments of the Popes, before the laws framed in England were sufficient to resist them, as follows:—" When the Popes began to extend their power beyond the limits assigned them by the Canons, they met with great opposition in England, in all the branches of their usurpations, but they managed all the advantages they found, either from the weakness or ill circumstances of Princes, so steadily, that, in conclusion, they subdued the world; and if they had not by their cruel exactions so oppressed the Clergy, that they were driven to seek shelter under the covert of the temporal authority, the world was then so overmastered by superstition and credulity, that not only the whole spiritual power, but even the temporal power of Princes, was likely to have fallen into the Pope's hands: but the discontented Clergy supported the secular power as much as they had before advanced the Papal tyranny. Boniface VIII. had raised his pretensions to that impudent pitch, that he declared all power both ecclesiastical and civil was derived from him, and established that as an article of faith necessary to salvation; and he and his successors took upon them to dispose of all ecclesiastical

“benefices by their Bulls and Provisions.”—BURNET’s Abridgment, p. 70.

9th, BURNET’s statement of the Act of Parliament abolishing the payment of first fruits to Rome, from which Act it appears that 800,000 ducats had been transmitted from England to Rome, since the commencement of Henry VII.’s reign; without which payments no Bulls were granted by the Pope, for holding Bishoprics or Livings in England.—See Burnet’s Abridgment, p. 82.

10th, BURNET’s account of Henry VIII.’s remonstrance against the allegiance due to the Pope from his own Bishops, which is thus stated: “At that time the King sent for the Speaker of the House of Commons, and told him, he found that the Prelates were but half subjects; for they swore at their consecration an oath to the Pope that was inconsistent with their allegiance and oath to the King: by their oath to the Pope they swore to be in no counsel against him, nor to disclose his secrets, but to maintain the Papacy and regalities of St. Peter against all men, together with the rights and authorities of the Church of Rome, and observe all the decrees, sentences, provisions, and commandments of that See. In their oath to the King they renounced all clauses in their Bulls contrary to the King’s royal dignity, and did swear to be faithful to him, and to live and die with him, against all others, and to keep his counsel, acknowledging that they held their Bishoprics only of him: by these it appeared that they could not keep both those oaths in case a breach should fall out between the King and the Pope.”—Burnet’s Abridgment, p. 87.

11th, BURNET’s account of an Act of Parliament depriving Cardinal Campeius and another of the Bishoprics of Salisbury and Worcester; which Act assigns for reasons, their not residing in their dioceses, but at the Court of Rome, and carrying £3000 per annum out of the kingdom.—Ibid. p. 114.

12th, BURNET’s abstract of FRITH’s book against Purgatory: “He shewed” (says BURNET), “that there was no men-

“tion made of Purgatory in the Scripture; that it was inconsistent with the merits of Christ, by which, upon sincere repentance, all sins were pardoned; for, if they were pardoned, they could not be punished: and though temporal judgments, either as medicinal corrections or for giving warnings to others, do sometimes fall even on true Penitents; yet terrible punishments in another state cannot consist with a free pardon, and the remembering of our sins no more. In expounding many passages of the New Testament, he appealed to Erasmus, and shewed that *the fire* which was spoken of by St. Paul, as that which would consume the *wood, hay, and stubble*, could only be meant of the fiery trial of persecution: he shewed that the primitive Church received it not; Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustin did not believe it; the last had plainly said that no mention was made of it in Scripture. The Monks brought it in; and by many wonderful stories possessed the world with the belief of it; and had made a very gainful trade of it. This book provoked the Clergy so much, that they resolved to make the author feel a real fire for endeavouring to extinguish their imaginary one.”—Ibid. p. 128. And again: “The pen proving too feeble and too gentle a tool, the Clergy betook themselves to that on which they relied more; many were vexed with imprisonments, for teaching their children the Lord’s Prayer in English, for harbouring the preachers, and for speaking against the corruptions in the worship or the vices of the Clergy.”—Ibid. p. 129. And then BURNET relates the burning of FRITH, by the cruel Bishop of Winchester, GARDINER, for his denial of Purgatory and Transubstantiation; the arguments against which last doctrine are stated by BURNET, as well as those against Purgatory.

13th, BURNET’s account of the visitation of the Monasteries, and other Religious Houses, which shall be given in his own words:

“The foundation of all their wealth” (says he) “was the belief of Purgatory, and of the virtue that was in

“ Masses to redeem souls out of it; and that these eased the
“ torments of departed souls, and at last delivered them out of
“ them: so it passed among all for a piece of piety to parents,
“ and of care for their own souls and families, to endow those
“ houses with some lands, upon condition that they should
“ have Masses said for them, as it was agreed on more or less,
“ frequently according to the measure of the gift. This was
“ like to have drawn in the whole wealth of the nation into
“ those houses, if the Statute of Mortmain had not put some
“ restraint to that superstition. They also persuaded the
“ world, that the Saints interceded for them, and would take it
“ kindly at their hands if they made great offerings to their
“ shrines, and would thereupon intercede the more earnestly
“ for them. The credulous vulgar measuring the court of Hea-
“ ven by those on earth, believed presents might be of great
“ efficacy there, and thought the new favourites would have
“ the most weight on their intercessions: so upon every new
“ canonization there was a new fit of devotion towards the
“ last Saint, which made the elder to grow almost out of re-
“ quest. Some images were believed to have an extraordinary
“ virtue in them, and pilgrimages to these were much extolled.
“ There was also great rivalry among the several orders, and
“ different houses of the same orders, every one magnifying their
“ own saints, and their images and relics most. The wealth
“ of these houses brought them under great corruptions.
“ They were generally very dissolute, and grossly ignorant.
“ Their privileges were become a public grievance, and
“ their lives gave great scandal to the world; so that, as
“ they had found it easy to bear down the secular Clergy,
“ when their own vices were more secret, the begging Friars
“ found it as easy to carry the esteem of the world from them.
“ These, under the appearance of poverty, and coarse diet and
“ clothing, gained much esteem, and became almost the only
“ preachers and confessors then in the world. They had a Ge-
“ neral at Rome, from whom they received such directions as
“ the Popes sent them; so that they were more useful to the

“ Papacy than the Monks had been. They had also the
 “ school-learning in their hands, so that they were generally
 “ much cherished. But they living much in the world, could
 “ not conceal their vices so artificially as the Monks had done;
 “ and though several reformations had been made of their
 “ orders, yet they had all fallen under great scandal, and a
 “ general disesteem. The King” (Henry VIII.) “ intended
 “ to erect new Bishoprics; and in order to that, it was neces-
 “ sary to make use of some of their revenues. He also ap-
 “ prehended a war from the Emperor, and for that end he
 “ intended to fortify his harbours, and to encourage shipping
 “ and trade, upon which, the balance of the world began then to
 “ turn: and in order to that, he resolved to make use of the
 “ wealth of those houses, and thought, the best way to bring
 “ that into his hands, would be to expose their vices, that so
 “ they might quite lose the esteem they might yet be in with
 “ some, and so it might be less dangerous to suppress them.
 “ CRANMER promoted this much, both because these houses
 “ were founded on gross abuses, and subsisted by them; and
 “ because these were necessary to be removed, if a Reformation
 “ went on. The extent of many dioceses was also such, that
 “ one man could not oversee them; so he intended to have
 “ more Bishoprics founded, and to have houses at every Ca-
 “ thedral for the education of those who should be employed
 “ in the pastoral charge. The visitors went over England,
 “ and found in many places monstrous disorders. The sin of
 “ Sodom was found in many houses; great factions, and bar-
 “ barous cruelties, were in others; and in some, they found
 “ tools for coining. The Report contained many abominable
 “ things, that are not fit to be mentioned: some of these were
 “ printed, but the greatest part is lost; only a report of one
 “ hundred and forty-four houses is yet extant.”—Burnet’s
 Abridgment, p. 147 et seq.

Again: “ They discovered many Impostures about Relics,
 “ and wonderful Images, to which, pilgrimages had been wont
 “ to be made. At Reading they had an angel’s wing, which

“ brought over the spear’s point that pierced our Saviour’s
“ side: as many pieces of the cross were found, as, joined to-
“ gether, would have made a big cross. The Rood of Grace
“ at Bexley in Kent, had been much esteemed, and drawn
“ many Pilgrims to it: it was observed to bow, and roll its eyes,
“ and look at times well pleased, or angry; which the cre-
“ dulous multitude imputed to a divine power: but all this
“ was discovered to be a cheat, and it was brought up to St.
“ Paul’s Cross; and all the springs were openly shewed that
“ governed its several motions. At Hales, in Gloucestershire,
“ the blood of Christ was shewed in a vial; and it was believed,
“ that none could see it who were in mortal sin: and so, after
“ good presents were made, the deluded Pilgrims went away
“ well satisfied if they had seen it. This was the blood of a
“ duck renewed every week, put in a vial very thick of one
“ side, as thin on the other; and either side turned towards
“ the Pilgrim, as the Priests were satisfied with their obla-
“ tions. Several other such-like Impostures were discovered,
“ which contributed much to the undeceiving the people.

“ The richest shrine in England was Thomas à Becket’s
“ at Canterbury, whose story is well known. After he had
“ long embroiled England, and shewed that he had a spirit so
“ turned to faction, that he could not be at quiet, some of
“ Henry the Second’s officious servants killed him in the
“ Church at Canterbury: he was presently canonized, and
“ held in greater esteem than any other Saint whatsoever; so
“ much more was a Martyr for the Papacy valued, than any
“ that suffered for the Christian Religion: and his altar drew
“ far greater oblations, than those that were dedicated to
“ Christ, or the Blessed Virgin; as appears by the accounts of
“ two of their years.

“ In one, 3l. 2s. 6d. and in another, not a penny was
“ offered at Christ’s altar. There was in one, 63l. 5s. 6d.
“ and in another, 4l. 1s. 8d. offered at the Blessed Virgin’s
“ altar. But in these very years there was 832l. 12s. 3d.
“ and 964l. 6s. 3d. offered at St. Thomas’s altar. The Shrine

“ grew to be of an inestimable value. Lewis the Seventh of France came over in Pilgrimage to visit it, and offered a stone, valued to be the richest in Europe. He had not only one holy day, the 29th December, called his Martyrdom; but also the day of his translation, the 7th of July, was also a holy day; and every 50th year there was a Jubilee, and an Indulgence granted to all that came and visited his tomb: and sometimes there were believed to be 100,000 Pilgrims there on that occasion. It is hard to tell whether the hatred to his seditious practices, or the love of his shrine, set on King Henry more to unsaint him. His shrine was broken, and the gold of it was so heavy, that it filled two chests, which took eight men apiece to carry them out of the Church; and his skull, which had been so much worshipped, was proved to be an imposture; for the true skull was with the rest of his bones in his coffin: his bones were either burnt, as it was given out at Rome; or so mixed with other bones, as our writers say, that it had been a miracle indeed, to have distinguished them afterwards.”

—Burnet’s Abridgment, book i. p. 200 et seq.

14th, The whole History of CRANMER and the other early Reformers, as given by BURNET: a single example of their attachment to the Scriptures occurs in p. 171 :

“ Cranmer took occasion to shew the vanity of the school divinity, and the uncertainty of tradition; and that Religion had been so corrupted in the latter ages, that there was no finding out the truth, but by resting in the authority of the Scriptures: Fox, Bishop of Hereford, seconded him, and told them, *the world was now awake*, and would be no longer imposed on by the niceties and dark terms of the Schools: for the Laity now did not only read the Scriptures in the vulgar tongues, but searched the originals themselves; therefore they must not think to govern them, as they had done in the times of ignorance.”

Again, in p. 207: “ This year (1537) the English Bible was finished. The Translation was sent over to Paris to

“ be printed there, for the workmen in England were not
“ thought able to go about it. BONNER was then Ambassa-
“ dor in France, and he obtained a License of FRANCIS
“ for printing it; but upon a complaint made by THE
“ FRENCH CLERGY, the press was stopped, and *many of the*
“ *copies were seized on and burnt.* So it was brought over
“ to England and finished: CROMWELL procured a general
“ warrant from the King, allowing all his subjects to read it,
“ for which CRANMER wrote his thanks to CROMWELL, and
“ rejoiced to see the day of Reformation now risen in Eng-
“ land, *since the Word of God did shine over it all without*
“ *a cloud:* not long after this, CROMWELL gave out injunctions,
“ requiring the Clergy to set up Bibles in their Churches, and
“ to encourage all to read them.”—This was the *first* Eng-
lish Bible published by *authority*, and allowed to be gene-
rally used.

Again: “ Six Bibles were set up in divers places of St. Paul’s; but BONNER being afraid of the mischief they might do, posted up near them an admonition to the people, that none should read them with vain-glory and corrupt affections, or draw multitudes about them when they read them. *But great numbers gathered about those that read; and such as had good voices used to be reading them aloud a great part of the day:* many sent their children to school, and when they had learned to read, they carried them to Church to read the Bibles. Some began likewise to argue from them, particularly against taking away the Cup in the Communion, and the worship *in an unknown tongue;* upon which BONNER set up a new advertisement, and threatened to remove them, if these abuses were not corrected; and upon the complaints made of those things, the free use of the Scriptures was afterwards much restrained.”—Ibid. p. 262.

15th, BURNET’s remarks on the Pope’s Bull against King Henry VIII.; in which he observes (among other things):

“ By this sentence it is certain, that, either the Pope’s infallibility must be confessed to be a cheat put upon the

“ world, or, if any believe it, they must acknowledge that
“ the power of deposing princes is really lodged in that Chair;
“ for this was not a sudden fit of passion, but was done, *ex*
“ *cathedra*, with all the deliberation they ever admit of. The
“ sentence was, in some particulars, without a precedent; but
“ as to the main points, of deposing the King, and absolving
“ his subjects from their obedience, there was abundance of
“ instances to be brought in these last five hundred years, to
“ shew that this had been all along asserted the right of the
“ Papacy. The Pope wrote also to the Kings of France and
“ Scotland, with design to inflame them against King Henry.”
—Ibid. book i. p. 204.

16th, BURNET’s observations on the change effected by the Reformation in the observance of the Sabbath:

“ A great charge was also given for the strict observation
“ of the Lord’s-day, which was appointed to be spent wholly
“ in the service of God; it not being enough to hear Mass,
“ or Matins, in the morning, and spend the rest of the day
“ in drunkenness and quarrelling, as was commonly practised;
“ but it ought to be all employed either in the duties of Reli-
“ gion, or in acts of charity.”—Ibid. book ii. p. 25.

17th, BURNET’s account of the abrogation of Ceremonies:
“ Candlemass and Lent were now approaching, so the
“ Clergy and people were much divided with relation to the
“ ceremonies usual at those times. By some injunctions in
“ King Henry’s reign, it had been declared, that fasting in
“ Lent was only binding by a positive law. Wakes and
“ Plough Mondays were also suppressed, and hints were
“ given that other customs which were much abused, should
“ be shortly put down. The gross rabble loved these things;
“ as matters of diversion, and thought divine worship without
“ them would be but a dull business. But others looked on
“ these as relics of heathenism, since the Gentiles worshipped
“ their Gods with such festivities, and thought they did not
“ become the gravity and simplicity of the Christian Religion.
“ CRANMER, upon this, procured an Order of Council against

“ the carrying of candles on Candlemass day, of ashes on
“ Ash Wednesday, and palms on Palm Sunday ; which was
“ directed to BONNER, to be intimated to the Bishops of the
“ province of Canterbury, and was executed by him.”—Ibid.
book ii. p. 49.

Again : “ Soon after this, a general order followed for a
“ removal of all images out of churches : there were every
“ where great contests, whether the images had been abused
“ to superstition, or not. Some thought the consecration of
“ them was an abuse common to them all. Those also that
“ represented the Trinity as a man with three faces in one
“ head, or as an old man with a young man before him, and
“ a dove over his head ; and some where the Blessed Virgin
“ was represented as assumed into it, gave so great scandal,
“ that it was no wonder if men, as they grew to be better en-
“ lightened, could no longer endure them.”—Ibid. book ii.
p. 50.

And again : “ The plain institution of the Sacrament was
“ much vitiated, with a mixture of many heathenish rites
“ and pomps, on design to raise the credit of the Priests, in
“ whose hands that great performance was lodged. This was
“ at first done to draw over the heathens, by those splendid
“ rites, to Christianity : but superstition, once begun, has no
“ bounds nor measures ; and ignorance and barbarity increas-
“ ing in the darker ages, there was no regard had to any thing
“ in Religion, but as it was set off with much pageantry ; and
“ the belief of the corporal presence raised this to a great
“ height. The Office was in an unknown tongue ; all the
“ vessels and garments belonging to it were consecrated with
“ much devotion ; a great part of the service was secret, to
“ make it look like a wonderful charm ; the consecration itself
“ was to be said very softly, for words that were not to be
“ heard agreed best with a change that was not to be seen.
“ The many gesticulations and the magnificent processions all
“ tended to raise the pageantry higher. Masses were also
“ said for all the turns and affairs of human life.

“ Trentals, a custom of having thirty Masses a year, on the chief festivities for redeeming souls out of Purgatory, was that which brought the Priests most money; for these were thought God’s best days, in which access was easier to him. On Saints’ days, in the Mass it was prayed, that by the Saints’ intercession the sacrifice might become the more acceptable, and procure a larger indulgence, which could not be easily explained, if the sacrifice was the death of Christ; besides a numberless variety of other rites, so many of the relics of Heathenism were made use of for the corrupting of the holiest institution of the Christian Religion.”—Ibid. book ii. p. 52.

18th, BURNET’s remarks on Confession, Absolution, and Indulgences:

“ Priests also managed Confession and Absolution, so as to enter into all men’s secrets, and to govern their consciences by them; but they becoming very ignorant, and not so associated as to be governed by orders that might be sent them from Rome, the Friars were every where employed to hear Confessions; and many *reserved cases* were made, in which the Pope only gave Absolution *; these were trusted to them, and they had the trade of Indulgences put in their hands, which they managed with as much confidence as mountebanks used in selling their medicines, with this advantage, that the ineffectualness of their devices was not so easily discovered, for the people believed all that the Priests told them. In this they grew to such a pitch of confidence, that for saying some Collects, Indulgences for years, and for hundreds, thousands, yea, a million of years, were granted; so cheap a thing was Hea-

* BURNET remarks further on “reserved cases” (in book iii. p. 264): “The more scandalous abuses were reserved to the Popes themselves, whose special prerogative it has always been to be the most eminent transgressors of all canons and constitutions.”—See, however, MR. DALLAS’s defence of “reserved cases,” in p. 63 of his Defence of the Jesuits.

“ ven made ! This trade was now thrown out of the Church.”
—*Ibid.* book ii. p. 55.

And further: “ All the consecrations of water, salt, &c. in the Church of Rome, looked like the remainders of Heathenism, and were laid aside: by these, devils being adjured, and a divine virtue supposed to be in them, the people came to think, that by such observances they might be sure of Heaven: The Absolutions (by which, upon the account of the merits of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, the sprinklings of water, fastings, and pilgrimages, with many other things, sins were pardoned, as well as on the account of the passion of Christ, and the absolution given to dead bodies) looked like gross impostures, tending to make the world think, that, besides the painful way to Heaven, in a course of true holiness, the Priests had secrets in their hands, of carrying people thither in another method, and on easier terms: and this drew in the people to purchase their favor, especially when they were dying; so that, as their fears were then heightened, there was no other way left them, in the conclusion of an ill life, to die with any good hopes, but as they bargained for them with their Priests: therefore all this was now cast out. It was resolved to have the whole worship in the vulgar tongue, upon which St. Paul has copiously enlarged himself: and all nations, as they were converted to Christianity, had their offices in their vulgar tongue; but of late, it had been pretended, that it was a part of the Communion of Saints, that the worship should be every where in the same language; though the people were hardly used, when, for the sake of some vagrant Priests, that might come from foreign parts, they were kept from knowing what was said in the worship of God. It was pretended, that Pilate, having ordered the inscription on the Cross, in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, these three languages were sanctified; but it is not easy to understand what authority he had for conferring such a privilege on them. But the keeping all in an unknown tongue, preserved in dark ages

“ the esteem of their Offices, in which there were such
 “ Prayers and Hymns, and such Lessons, that if the people
 “ had understood them, they must have given great scandal :
 “ in many Prayers, the pardon of sins and the grace of God
 “ were asked, in such a style, of the Saints, as if these had
 “ been wholly at their disposal, and as if they had been more
 “ merciful than God, or Christ.”—Ibid. book ii. p. 59.

19th, BURNET’s observations on Celibacy :

“ The pretence of chastity in the Romish Priests, had
 “ possessed the world with a high opinion of them; and would
 “ have been a great reflection on the Reformers, if the world
 “ had not clearly seen through it, and been made very sensible
 “ of the ill effects of it, by the defilement it brought into their
 “ own beds and families.”—Ibid. book ii. p. 69 *.

20th, BURNET’s observations on the abuse of Fasting :

“ Christ had told his disciples, that when he was taken
 “ from them, they should fast: so in the Primitive Church,
 “ they fasted before Easter; but the same number of days
 “ was not observed in all places; afterwards other rules and
 “ days were set up; but St. Austin complained, that many in
 “ his time placed all their religion in observing them. Fast-
 “ days were turned to a mockery in the Church of Rome, in
 “ which they both dined, and did eat fish dressed exquisitely,
 “ and drank wine.”—Ibid. book ii. p. 73.

21. BURNET calls Transubstantiation one of “ the designs
 “ of the Priests, for establishing the authority of that Order,
 “ which by its character was qualified for the greatest perform-
 “ ance that ever was; no wonder,” says he, “ they took all
 “ imaginable pains to infuse it into the belief of the world:
 “ and those dark ages were disposed to believe every thing so

* See, on this subject, the whole of the Chapter in HASENMUL-
 LER’s History of the Jesuits, entitled, “ De secundo Jesuitarum Voto,
 “ quod est Castitatis perpetuæ;” a chapter which, from the nature of
 its contents, the laws of decency forbid to be copied, or even to be
 referred to, in any plainer terms,

“ much the rather, the more incredible that it appeared to be.”—*Ibid.* book ii. p. 83.

22d, BURNET’s statement of CRANMER’s remarks upon the lovers of Popery ; namely,

“ That their being fond of a worship, which they understood not, and being desirous to be kept still in ignorance, without the Scriptures, shewed their Priests had greater power over them, than the common reason of all mankind had.”—*Ibid.* book ii. p. 90

23d, BURNET’s account of the last moments of Edward VI.

“ A few moments before he died, he interceded very fervently for his subjects, that God would preserve England from Popery, and maintain his true Religion among them.”—*Ibid.* book ii. p. 200.

24th, His account of the duplicity of bloody Queen Mary on her ascending the throne :

“ The men of Suffolk were generally for the Reformation; yet a great body of them came to her, and asked her, if she would promise not to alter the Religion set up in King Edward’s days: she assured them she would make no changes; but should be content with the private exercise of her own Religion. Upon that, they all vowed they would live and die with her.”—*Ibid.* book iii. p. 208.

After which, BURNET says, they “ came and put the Queen in mind of her promise; but she sent them home with a cold answer, and told them, they must learn to obey her, and not pretend to govern her: and one that had spoken more confidently than the rest, was set in a pillory for it three days, as having said words that tended to defame the Queen. This was a sad omen of a severe Government, in which the claiming of promises went for a crime.”—*Ibid.* book iii. p. 220.

25th, His account of the reasons of Queen Mary’s marriage with the Popish Prince Philip of Spain :

“ She found it would be hard to bring the nation about in

“ matters of Religion, without the assistance of a foreign power.”—Ibid. book iii. p. 233.

And of the just alarms of a British House of Commons upon such an alliance :

“ When the treaty of the Queen’s marriage came to be known, the House of Commons was much alarmed at it; and they sent their Speaker, with twenty of their members, with an address to her not to marry a stranger: and they were so inflamed, that the Court judged it necessary to dissolve the Parliament.”—Ibid. book iii. p. 236.

26th, BURNET’s account of the Queen’s deprivation of the old Bishops, and the creation of sixteen new ones; as also of her putting out no fewer than Twelve Thousand of the Clergy without any trials, under the pretence of their *being married*, as occurring in book iii. p. 250.

See also the whole of BURNET’s affecting account of the persecution of the Protestants in Queen Mary’s time, as detailed from p. 271 of his third Book, anno 1555, to the end of her ignominious and sanguinary reign, which concluded in the year 1558; especially his account of the burning of ROGERS, HOOPER, TAYLOR, BRADFORD, RIDLEY, LATIMER, and CRANMER. The statement is too interesting in all its parts to convey any idea of it in an abridgment; but one passage relating to the JESUITS, as more particularly to our purpose, may be added, and this shall conclude the extracts from BURNET.

“ The Jesuits were at this time beginning to grow considerable: they were tied, besides their own vows, to an absolute obedience to the See of Rome; and set themselves every where to open free schools, for the education of youth, and to bear down heresy. They were excused from the hours of the choir, and so were looked on as a mongrel Order, between the Regulars and the Seculars. They proposed to Cardinal Pole, that since the Queen was restoring the Abbey lands, it would be to little purpose to give them again to the Benedictine Order, which was now rather

“ a clog than a help to the Church: and therefore they de-
“ sired that houses might be assigned to THEM for maintaining
“ Schools and Seminaries, and they did not doubt but that
“ they should quickly drive out heresy, and recover the Church
“ lands. Pole did not listen to this, for which he was much
“ censured by the Fathers of that Society. It is not certain
“ whether he had then the sagacity to foresee that disorder
“ which they were likely to bring into the government of the
“ Church, and that corruption of morals that has since flow-
“ ed from their Schools, and has been infused by them gene-
“ rally in Confessions, so that their whole Church is now
“ overrun with it.”—Ibid. book iii. p. 295.

The importance of the above Extracts must apologize for their length. It cost MR. DALLAS, indeed, but a few lines, when he sought to destroy the beautiful fabric of the Reformation: but so much easier is it to pull down than to build up, that it has required several pages to shew that MR. DALLAS was not justified in asserting that “ the Reformation has generated the most absurd superstitions;” and to prove that it was POPERY, on the contrary, and not THE REFORMATION, which was the prolific mother of “ absurd superstitions,” and the source of grievous corruptions in doctrine, and of shameful vices in practice; all of which, but for the Reformation, would be at this moment in full and vigorous operation among us.

Let the Public decide, whether, after the view which has been given of the state of Religion in England before the Reformation, the honour of God and the interests of the nation did not imperiously demand a change: we shall then discover whether the opinion entertained by MR. DALLAS rests upon a rock, or upon the sand, when he declares that he “ cannot conceive that there is a man of unbiassed mind and good sense, who would not rather embrace all that has been retrenched from the Catholic Creed, than adopt the spurious abominations and blasphemies, which every where, under the screen of toleration, disgrace the world.”

MR. DALLAS, from vilifying the Reformation and defending Popery, comes (p. 60) to the defence of the CASUISTRY of the Jesuits :

This is all in its order—whoever can call himself a Protestant, and yet admire a Religion so contrary to his own, may be expected to advocate the Casuistry upon which that Religion is founded, and by which it is upheld. MR. DALLAS begins his remarks on the Jesuitical Casuistry by observing, “ I inquired more particularly into the character and objects “ of the Casuists of the Order ; and the more I reflected, the “ more I was convinced of the malignity of the adversaries “ of the Society,” whom he then accuses of rebellious and “ revolutionary” purposes.

Without stopping here to shew how little such a charge applies to those enemies of Casuistry, PASCAL, NICOLE, and the several Ecclesiastics and Advocates of France, who ranged with such triumphant success on the same side, we will proceed to MR. DALLAS’s exculpatory observations: “ In such a “ number of casuistical writers” (he says), “ it may be ima-“ gined that some have erred—THE JESUITS NEVER WISHED “ TO DEFEND THEM.” Now, this assertion is at direct variance with the following facts: namely, that the flagitious work of the Jesuit PIROT was openly claimed by the Jesuits as their own, in the face of the French nation and its Clergy ; that the work of the Jesuit MOYA was published with the express sanction of the Superiors of the Order ; that the *Somme des Pêchés*, by the Jesuit BAUNI, was *publicly avowed and defended by the Society* ; and that the Jesuit BERRUYER was *as openly countenanced and protected by the same Society, after two Popes had censured his works as blasphemous and impious*.

MR. DALLAS then proceeds—“ THE APOLOGY FOR THE “ CASUISTS, said to be published by the Jesuits, so far from “ being avowed as a work of their own, was disavowed by the “ Superiors of the Order, and condemned by the Pope and “ many Prelates: it was written by PERE PIROT.”

Now, although it is true that this nefarious work was written by PIROT, MR. DALLAS has not informed us that he was an eminent Jesuit, who was, on this occasion, the organ and instrument of the Society; and although it is true that the Pope and many Prelates condemned this work, it is certain that the Society publicly defended it, notwithstanding it contained the fullest apology for assassination, rebellion, and every thing most at war with the peace and happiness of the human species. In this work, revenge, false honour, illicit pleasure, pride, sedition, and murder are expressly justified. It appeared in 1657. The Clergy of Paris were so struck with its pernicious doctrines, that they determined to denounce it to the Parliament; upon which the Jesuits applied to the Court to prohibit the Parliament from taking cognizance of the affair. The King complied with their wishes, and referred the matter to a different authority—the Clergy protested against this, affirming, that in the case of another Jesuit (BAGOT), justice had been defeated by a similar reference. They presented a memorial to the Grand Vicars of Paris, requiring the condemnation of this work, at the same time dispersing a declaration, which is the first of the celebrated statements published by the Clergy, as a body, against the Casuistry of the Jesuits; and which was followed by nine others, all distinguished by the vigour of their composition, and the importance of their matter. These were severally signed by the Clergy of Paris; and appeared in the years 1658 and 1659. ARNAULD, NICOLE, and PASCAL, were the principal writers of these papers; and a more forcible and masterly exposition of the most flagrant crimes, and of the casuistry by which those crimes were defended, could not have been produced. The Clergy began by calling this work of PIROT anonymous, although they knew its author; upon which, with a view to intimidate their opponents, the Jesuits impudently and openly declared that the book was published *with their knowledge and under their sanction*. “ Since the “ Jesuits” (say the Clergy in their first letter) “ have now

" publicly admitted themselves the protectors of the Apology
" of the Casuists, we as publicly denounce it."

Independently of this opposition of the Clergy of Paris to the work; above twenty Bishops, and at length even Pope ALEXANDER VII. (although on every other occasion the avowed friend of the Jesuits), condemned this book and the horrid maxims it contained *.

So much for MR. DALLAS's statement that PIROT's Apology for the Casuists was disavowed by the Order of Jesuits!

MR. DALLAS next defends the Casuist L'AMY, or AMICUS (p. 64); and confidently affirms, that " the proposition attributed to him to blacken him as a Jesuit was not his, nor ever adopted by him." He then asserts, that " It had been taught long before by the celebrated Casuist NAVARRE, and others totally unconnected with the Jesuits. Amicus mentions it, and alleges the reasons which had been given in support of it;" but adds, " nolumus a nobis (hæc) ita sint dicta ut communi sententiae adversentur, sed tantum disputandi gratiâ proposita;" and MR. DALLAS adds, that the proposition " was omitted altogether in the second Edition of his work."

Let us now see how the fact really stands. The proposition, as stated in the " Brief Account of the Jesuits," runs thus: " The religious may kill those who attack their honour: they are even obliged to this, when the credit of their whole Order would suffer if they did not; as when one threatens to publish their own crimes, or those of their Order, when there is no other way of preventing it, as it seems there is not, if the slanderer is about to accuse the Order, or the individual, before persons of eminence."

* See *Les Ecrits des Curés de Paris*, which have been frequently printed, and especially the Extracts from the writings of the Casuists given in those Letters. The Letters and Extracts are all printed in *La Théologie morale des Jesuites et nouveaux Casuistes*, printed at Cologne in 1666, from which the above facts are taken. Of this masterly work it may be said: " *Monumenta rerum posteris quærentibus tradidit.*"—*Quinctil.*

The whole of the above proposition appears in the Edition of DOUAY, but only *a part* of it in the Antwerp Edition; since the Jesuits caused the latter Edition to be printed without the whole of the passage, in order that they might escape the Decree of the Council of Brabant, which had just at that time indued the Faculty of Louvain to censure this doctrine. Even in the Antwerp Edition, however, and *in every other*, the following part of the proposition is printed, viz. “ Ne-
 “ gari non potest, quin saltem honorem famamque illam
 “ quæ ex virtute et sapientia nascitur, quique verus honor
 “ est, juste defendere Clerici ac Religiosi valeant, ac sæpe de-
 “ beant, cum hic sit proprius professionis ipsorum, quem si
 “ amittant, maximum bonum ac decus amittunt: nam per
 “ hunc redduntur summopere aestimabiles et conspiciui secula-
 “ ribus, quos suâ virtute dirigere ac juvare possunt, quo sub-
 “ lato nec illos dirigere nec juvare poterunt. Ergo saltem
 “ hunc honorem poterunt Clerici ac Religiosi cum moderamine
 “ inculpatæ tutelæ **ETIAM CUM MORTE INVASORIS** defendere:
 “ quin interdum lege saltem charitatis videntur ad illum de-
 “ fendendum teneri, si ex violatione propriæ famæ integra
 “ Religio infametur.”—AMICUS, Vol. v. Disp. 36.

That part of the proposition which the Jesuits retrenched in the Antwerp Edition (and which is no other than a conclusion from the above premises) is as follows :

“ Unde licebit Clerico vel Religioso calumniatorem gravia
 “ crimina de se vel sua Religione spargere minantem occidere,
 “ quando alius defendendi modus non suppetat, uti suppetere
 “ non videtur si calumniator sit paratus ea vel ipsi Religiosos,
 “ vel ejus Religioni publicè ac coram gravissimis viris impin-
 “ gere, nisi occidatur. Nam si in tali casu licitum est Reli-
 “ gioso, ne ipse occidatur, invasorem prius occidere, si fugâ
 “ non possit, quia nimirum hostem ante se habet, mortem
 “ evadere; licitum quoque eidem erit ad vitandam gravissi-
 “ mam sui suæque Religionis infamiam, si alius modus non
 “ suppetat, calumniatorem occidere. Nam quo jure licitum
 “ est Sæculari in tali casu calumniatorem occidere, eodem jure

“ licitum videtur Clerico ac Religioso, cum in hoc Religiosus
 “ et Sæcularis sint omnino pares; cum non minus jus in talem
 “ honorem habeat Clericus et Religiosus, quam Sæcularis in
 “ suum: imo majus, quanto major est professio sapientiæ et
 “ virtutis, ex quâ hic honor Clerico et Religioso progignitur,
 “ quâ sit valor et dexteritas armorum ex quâ honor Sæcu-
 “ lari nascitur. Adde quod ut seq. sectione probabitur,
 “ licitum est Clericis ac Religiosis in tutelam suarum facul-
 “ tatum furem occidere, si alias modus eas defendendi non
 “ supersit: ergo multò magis id licitum videtur in tutelam
 “ famæ et honoris ex virtute et sapientiâ consurgentis. Verùm
 “ quoniam hæc apud alios scripta non legimus, nolumus ita
 “ à nobis dicta sint ut communī sententiæ adversentur, sed
 “ solum disputandi gratiâ proposita, maturo judicio relichto
 “ penes prudentem lectorem.” —AMICUS, Vol. v. Disp. 36.

It appears, therefore, that in every Edition of L'AMY's work, the great principle of the lawfulness of murdering a Religious Adversary is distinctly and positively asserted: but inasmuch as all the Editions do not contain such full reasoning upon that doctrine as the Edition of *Douay*, nor pursue it to those consequences which necessarily flow from such a doctrine (because the doctrine itself had at that moment been publicly attacked, and was about to be publicly condemned), therefore MR. DALLAS avails himself of the alteration which had taken place, at the instance of the Jesuits themselves, and asserts that “ the proposition was omitted altogether in the second edition of the work;” the fact being, that *every* Edition contains enough of the proposition to entitle the Writer who could advance it, to the execration of his own age, and of all succeeding times*.

In answer to MR. DALLAS's assertion, that this doctrine was taught by NAVARRE before, and never adopted by L'AMY,

* See *Dangereuses Propositions de la Morale tirées des Ouvrages des nouveaux Casuistes*, frequently reprinted, and published (among other documents) in the work cited in note to p. 235.

but only proposed by him as a subject for discussion, it may be observed, that it was clearly the doctrine of L'AMY himself, as well as of his predecessors, and of the Jesuits in general, since CARAMUEL the Jesuit maintains it as the only certain and sound opinion held by that learned body on the subject, while the opposite opinion, he says, has only *probability* in its favor; and he refers expressly to L'AMY, as having maintained the opinion, as well as NAVARRE, SUAREZ, GORDON, and SANCHIUS, and challenges any one to produce an instance of a single Theologian who had contradicted L'AMY in terms; while at the same time, he dares the opponent of such opinion himself, to decree or enjoin a contrary opinion in the tribunal of Confession, declaring, that if any of the Jesuits had ever appeared to contradict it, they had merely varied cases or circumstances, but had never directly opposed that opinion*.

MR. DALLAS next proceeds to the defence of the Casuist MOYA (p. 64), whom he has the effrontery to designate in these terms: “ MOYA seems to have been A VERY VIRTUOUS “ MAN, though perhaps rather indiscreet in his zeal for the “ Society.”

Let us now look a little into the character of this “ *very* “ *virtuous man*,” as displayed in his writings.

He was the Confessor of the Queen Mother of Spain; and when the consciences of Princes are placed in such hands, it is easy to guess what results must follow. His work, published

* “ Quæritur utrum Doctrina Petri Navarræ, Suari, et FRANCISCI “ AMICI, quæ allegatur, sit aliquâ censurâ digna? Et ego addo eamdem “ esse etiam Gordoni de Restit. Qu. 4. c. i. n. 7; Sanchii in Selectis “ Disp. 146, et aliorum etiam apud ipsos. Et vicissim interrogo utrum “ allegari unus possit Theologus qui in terminis AMICO contradicat? “ Interrogo an Censor ipse qui AMICI doctrinam condemnat, auderet in “ tribunali Confessionis jubere (jubere dico, non consuere) opinionem “ contrariam? DOCTRINAM AMICI SOLAM ESSE VERAM, ET OPPONI- “ TAM IMPROBABLEM CENSEMUS OMNES DOCTI: si qui enim videntur “ contradicere, mutant casum, et circumstantias alterant, non autem “ directè opponuntur.” — See CARAMUEL'S *Theologiae Fundamenta*, Fund. 55. Sect. 6. p. 544.

under the name of *AMADEUS GUIMENÆUS*, appeared very soon after L'AMY's; it was printed with the express sanction of the *Superiors of the Jesuits*, and professes in the title-page to have been published in answer to the complaints preferred by some persons against the moral opinions of the Jesuits.

The Faculty of Theology pronounced the public condemnation of this book, on the 3d of February, 1665; and a reference to that document will shew some of the errors and abominations of the work, which was justly entitled by a Parisian Divine, "the common sewer of every kind of profligacy." The Faculty declared, that "their respect for decency must prevent their censuring the abominations which it contained on the subject of chastity, and the infamies of which that author had become the apologist."

The King's Advocates stated, that it was "full of many propositions which were contagious, and calculated to corrupt all Christian morality; that Manslaughter, Theft, Simeony, Usury, and other crimes, which cannot be publicly named, were justified by the license of these modern Casuists; and that it was impossible to believe that the Pope, who was the protector of the Canons, and of discipline, could authorize laxity and profligacy; that he could wish to sanction infamous books, which were the horror of all the virtuous, nor permit that maxims so favourable to vice, and so contrary to the rules of piety, and to the letter and spirit of the Gospel, should be publicly inculcated*."

The discourse of MARAIS pronounced before the University of Paris on the 8th of October, 1664, and printed by Desprez, will assist in giving a further view of this work; as will also the publications of the Faculty of Theology, in one of which it is declared to contain "whatever the most irregular imagination had invented for a century, and whatever had till that period escaped the wickedness of mankind†."

* See *Récueil des Censures de la Faculté présenté au Roi 1720*, p. 309.

† See *Discours de l'Assemblée de la Faculté de Théologie*, p. 386.

From these specimens we may be better enabled to give due weight to the observations of MR. DALLAS, when he calls MOYA "A VERY VIRTUOUS MAN." If such characters as these go to the formation of MR. DALLAS's Pantheon, we must pause before we become parties to their apotheosis. Even the Romish Church felt some hesitation in canonizing men who could thus call good evil, and evil good; but MR. DALLAS, it seems, has no such "compunctionous visitings." It is enough for him, that these men were Jesuits, that they defended the Jesuits, and were defended by the Jesuits: let such titles to esteem be once established, and they shall not want the support of the modern Champion of the Jesuits.

The same remark is made by MR. DALLAS upon MOYA as upon PIROT, namely, that the opinions which they have advanced "did not originate with them, but had been taught by "the older Divines previous to the existence of the Order:" a fact which only serves more completely to establish the observation of CLAUDE in his masterly work on the Reformation (an observation which has been before noticed in this Reply); namely, that it is impossible to condemn the Jesuistical Casuists, without at the same time condemning the whole school of the Casuistical Theology, whether in the hands of Jesuits or simple Catholics. MR. DALLAS's observation on this head only demonstrates with greater force, that the errors of Jesuitism are radically the errors of a corrupted Religion; and that, although many good men of that communion have abhorred such principles, and many wise men have ridiculed them, yet that they have been in every age the great means and instruments by which bad men have advanced the interests of that Church,—since the majority in all Catholic countries receive without inquiry or examination, whatever their spiritual advisers may suggest.

The next Casuist over whom MR. DALLAS spreads his shield is BAUNI (p. 65).

It had been observed in the *Brief Account of the Jesuits*, that "BAUNI's *Somme des Pêchés* was proscribed by the

“ MANTES Convocation as exciting to licentiousness, and the
 “ corruption of all good morals; as violating natural justice,
 “ and the rights of man; excusing blasphemy, usury, and al-
 “ most all other sins as things of no criminality.”

MR. DALLAS tells us, in answer to this, that “ he was the
 “ intimate friend of the *Cardinal de la Rochefoucault, Arch-
 bishop of Sens*; was a zealous Missionary under the *Bishop
 of St. Pol de Leon*, and died of his Missionary labours;” that,
 “ if he treated others with lenity, it is certain he did not spare
 “ himself;” that his book “ was written by the positive order of
 “ a Bishop, probably the *Bishop of St. Pol de Leon*, and pub-
 “ lished by the positive order of the Bishop.”

Now, admitting all this to have been the case; what does it prove, but that this intimate of a Cardinal, Archbishop, and Bishop, did not sin alone; but that one of these illustrious personages in particular positively ordered him to write a book of the most infamous and immoral description, and then positively commanded him to publish it? So much for the *Holy Roman Church*!

MR. DALLAS, however, goes on to assert, that its publication was “ *unaccompanied by the sanction or approbation of any Jesuit*, nor was it used in their Schools; consequently its “ *doctrines are no wise attributable to the Society*:” after which he admits that “ it contains several relaxed propositions, de-“ *servedly censured by the French Clergy, in 1642.*”

Now the case is, that the *Somme des Péchés* was written by a man who was the Professor of Moral Theology in the College of *Clement* (the great College of the Jesuits), for such was the ostensible office which BAUNI held; and his work, which appeared in 1639, was expressly published in Paris, *with the approbation of the Provincial of the Society of Jesuits.*

The Faculty of Theology soon after condemned it*; but

* See the condemnation in many works, but especially in M. D'ARGENTRE', Vol. iii. p. 28 et seq.

the Jesuits succeeded, through the medium of the Chancellor, in preventing the publication of the judgment; and the Faculty then required of CARDINAL RICHELIEU, that such restriction should be taken off. After this, the assembly of the Clergy which was holden at MANTES, proceeded to give the character of this work, which has been noticed before*.

The University shewed, in a second memorial, that BAUNI also attacked the authority of Kings and Magistrates, and that the correspondence and communion of mind and sentiment, which the Jesuits declared to be so general amongst them, never appeared more evidently than in the destructive doctrine, which affected the safety and repose of all states and nations interested in the preservation of the authority, the power, and the lives of Kings; upon which doctrine their authors had stated that they were all in unison. And in order to prove to the Parliament the uniformity of sentiment subsisting among the Jesuits on this point, the University instances *thirty* of their Fathers who are all named; from which it concludes, " that the Jesuits hold themselves bound by no declaration " or promise, by no avowal or disavowal which they may have " made, but deceive mankind, and advance their own interests " by fair and specious professions, which they make no diffi- " culty of despising and violating, for the enlargement and " advantage of their Society, being obliged by their Constitu- " tions (p. 247, Edit. 1583), never on any occasion to lose " sight of its interests†."

Thus much may suffice in answer to MR. DALLAS's allegation, that the work of BAUNI was " unaccompanied by the " sanction or approbation of any Jesuits, and that its doc- " trines are no wise attributable to the Society."

The next Casuist who is defended, is BERRUYER—of him

* See the *Procès-verbal* published by the Convocation.

† For a complete summary of the infamous and immoral propositions maintained by BAUNI, see the *Censure de la Faculté de Théologie* contained in p. 184 of *La Théologie Morale des Jésuits*, Edit. Cologne, 1666.

it had been asserted in the *Brief Account of Jesuits*, that he “had been convicted of blasphemy, and condemned by BENEDICT XIII. and CLEMENT XIII.”: to which MR. DALLAS replies, “This is not true; he never was convicted of blasphemy.”

MR. DALLAS here shelters BERRUYER under a *jeu de mots*; for, when it was stated that BERRUYER had been convicted of blasphemy, it was not intended to assert that he had been *legally* and *judicially* convicted of blasphemy; but convicted of it, to the satisfaction of all honest men: in the well-known Pastoral Charge of the Bishop of Soissons, to which if MR. DALLAS refers, he will find that his worthy *protégé* openly denied the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the sacrifice of Christ, as taught by the Scriptures and held in the Church; and is as completely convicted of blasphemy as any writer can be, through the medium of the press.

MR. DALLAS then states, that his “*Histoire du Peuple de Dieu* was censured and condemned by BENEDICT XIV. and CLEMENT XIII.”; as if this were the only performance which they had declared against.

“The French Jesuits” (says MR. DALLAS) “disavowed the work, and submitted unanimously to the condemnation of it.” MR. DALLAS having himself set the example, he might perhaps be disposed to pardon the return of a certain compliment, if it were to be observed of the last-mentioned assertion, that it “*is not true*” so far indeed is it from being true, that whilst the performance of BERRUYER was passing through the ordeal of condemnation on the part of two Popes, twenty-four Bishops, several Theologians, and the General Assembly of the year 1755 (in the name of the Clergy of all France), the Jesuits multiplied the translations and editions of BERRUYER’s works in France, Spain, and Italy. The Society, in fact, both patronized and boasted of the writings of BERRUYER as perfect in their kind; they dispersed them among the Religious, the Laity, and Females of quality, as calculated to instruct them in the mysteries of religion, and to cherish their piety; not-

withstanding that they were full of the heresies of ARIUS, NERTORIUS, PELAGIUS, and SOCINUS.

The following piece of Jesuitical chronology may not perhaps be unacceptable: "In 1734, the first part of BERRUYER's works was condemned at Rome; in honour of this Decree, the Jesuits published the second part in 1753, which was far more objectionable than the first. This second part was condemned at Rome in 1755; in answer to which, the Jesuits published a translation of the first part in Italian, which translation was condemned at Rome, in 1757. The Jesuits, with profound respect for the Papal Decree, then published the second part in Italian, with an Apology: on the 17th of February, 1758, Pope BENEDICT XIV. condemned both the Translation and the Apology; to which the Jesuits, in their turn, replied by publishing the third part, which put the finishing stroke to the scandal. On the 2d of December following, Pope CLEMENT XIII. condemned it; and the Jesuits immediately translated the second part into Spanish, published two volumes of their Apologies at NANCY, and even sold the work, and its Apologies, at ROME, laden with eulogies. On 30th of August, 1759, these Apologies were condemned at Rome*."

BERRUYER, however, says MR. DALLAS, "WAS NOT A CASUIST." He was not called a CASUIST in the *Brief Account of the Jesuits*, but was cited as a writer of the Jesuits who had publicly supported "a system of morals which was any thing but the system of the Gospel, or of any Church which professes to be founded on its authority." Let the public decide whether this allegation has been proved.

MR. DALLAS next proceeds (p. 68) to the defence of CASNEDI, whom he calls "a man of great learning, zeal, and piety."

As learning is not wisdom, the first of CASNEDI's gifts

* See COUDRETTÉ, Vol. iv. p. 139, *in notis*; and the Manifesto of the King of Portugal, addressed to the Bishops of his Kingdom.

shall not be disputed; neither shall his **ZEAL**, as displayed in a bad cause, with a bad spirit, and for bad purposes: but with respect to his **PIETY**, the claims preferred for him on that score by **MR. DALLAS**, are too revolting to common sense to be passed over in silence.

It is well known that the Jesuits' corrupt system of casuistry is founded upon what they call the Doctrine of Philosophical Sin, the Doctrine of our Ignorance of the law of nature, the Doctrine of Probability, and other metaphysical subtleties of the like kind *.

* 1. The doctrine of *Philosophical Sin* (*le péché philosophique*) consists in teaching that the divine law obliges the sinner, so far only as it is actually intimated to him, and present with his mind at the time of sinning. If he does not at that moment reflect on the evil of the crime committed by him, he does not sin, although he violates the law of God: if he reflects on its evil, but only regards it as contrary to reason and propriety, without thinking of God, and eternal punishment; he sins indeed against reason, but not against God: this is simply a philosophical sin which merits temporal punishment, and not a theological sin which deserves eternal condemnation. The celebrated ARNAULD was the first to denounce and expose this dangerous doctrine, of which (observes a French writer) it may be said, as of the other casuistical doctrines of the Jesuits, that it *takes away the sins of the world*. 2. The doctrine which respects our ignorance of the law of nature (*l'Etat de pure nature*) appears to approach very nearly to the Theophilanthropism of the French Revolution. 3. The doctrine of *Probability* (*le Probabilisme*) was condemned by many Bishops of France, in 1658, as a maxim of the most impious and dangerous nature, and full of deadly poison. It teaches that we may, with a safe conscience, refer in all doubtful cases to the decision of one or many Doctors; and that their authority is valid in order to our embracing an opinion, to which the opposite opinion may be at the same time more probable and more safe. (See more particularly on this point, the notes of NICOLE on the 5th Provincial Letter of PASCAL.) It was by such and similar theories, that the Jesuits virtually overturned the two great rules of morality: namely, first, the Law of God, by maintaining that it might be violated with impunity, under cover of an ignorance assumed to be invincible; and secondly, the law of conscience, in sanctioning a course of conduct in direct opposition to its plainest dictates. With such

Now, it is not above sixty years since, that the Jesuit **CASNEDI**, upon these or similar principles, maintained in five folios, published by him in Portugal, that “**AT THE DAY OF JUDGMENT GOD WILL SAY TO MANY, COME, MY WELL-BELOVED, YOU WHO HAVE COMMITTED MURDER, WHO HAVE BLASPHEMED, &c. &c. BECAUSE YOU BELIEVED THAT IN SO DOING YOU WERE RIGHT.**”

Of this horrible proposition **MR. DALLAS** was not ignorant: and since it was not to be denied that **CASNEDI** had thus publicly recorded his own impiety, and that of his sect, **MR. DALLAS** expressly defends the proposition, as that of “**A MAN OF PIETY;**” affirming, that to maintain “*that the moral merit or demerit of an action depended upon the belief and intention of the agent, is a very simple and incontrovertible proposition;* but being expressed in ardent terms, “**it makes a flaming show among the articles of impeachment now instituted against the whole Society of Jesus.**”

If such reasoning as **MR. DALLAS**’s, in defence of such reasoning as **CASNEDI**’s, could be endured in this Christian country, we should be indeed at a very low ebb, both of principle and practice: and if general horror and indignation do not follow so foul and undisguised an attempt to consecrate impiety, to justify vice, and to erect a temple of worse than heathen corruption upon the ruins of our common Christianity; then, the sooner we renounce our national pretensions to a purer faith and a better practice than prevailed in the days of Paganism or Papacy, the better.

It must be obvious to the most superficial observer, that if **MR. DALLAS**’s notions of the nature of moral responsibility, and moral merit or demerit, were once to be generally acted upon, the whole frame of society itself must shortly be dissolved. Upon this principle, every man would at once become his own lawgiver, and, having no other rule or measure for his actions, than the particular view which he might himself “**blind leaders of the blind,**” how could it happen but that “**both should fall into the ditch?**”

happen to take of them; in other words, being only guilty or innocent in that proportion in which he might consider *himself* so, the greatest abominations would be divested of their impurity, and men would be converted into wild beasts upon principle!

But let us suppose that Society would continue to exist, notwithstanding the operation of such doctrines as these. Is it nothing, that individuals are to be imbued by their spiritual teachers with notions, which, if the Bible be true, must infallibly involve them in perdition? Is it nothing, that such blind guides as MR. DALLAS's "men of piety," are thus to "lead the blind" until "both fall into the ditch?" Are the solemnities of a Judgment Day to be thus trifled with? And is He who is "of purer eyes than to behold iniquity," to be thus openly defied and set at nought? If it be true, that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord," is it to be endured that those men should be held up to our admiration, who, while they profess to obey him, actually dispute the equity of his moral government, and deny the obligations of his own commands? But it is necessary to quit CASNEDI for the last Casuist who is defended by MR. DALLAS.

The last Casuist, though not the least, of whom MR. DALLAS undertakes the defence, is BENZI (p. 68), whom he is pleased (with the same defiance of public opinion, and the same contempt for historical testimony, as in other instances) to call "a respectable and much-injured man, *universally revered* in Venice, where he was a distinguished Director and Preacher."

Of BENZI, it had been stated in the *Brief Account of the Jesuits*, that "he defended *les attouchemens mamillaires* practised by the Jesuit Confessors."

To this charge MR. DALLAS replies, that "although BENZI is represented in several French and Italian libels, in the foul columns copied by the writer of the pamphlet," yet that, "far from teaching the horrors imputed to him, he merely gave an opinion in writing, on being consulted whe-

“ ther certain trespasses were to be considered as cases reserved, or not reserved. It was merely,” says MR. DALLAS, “ *a questio juris*, a technical opinion, and not a decision on the subject-matter: malice and calumny did the rest.”

Now, is MR. DALLAS really ignorant, that the justification of this flagitious practice by BENZI was so public and unequivocal as to induce no less a personage than Pope BENEDICT XIV. to issue a solemn decree against the doctrine taught by BENZI, both as infamous in itself, and as tending to the depravation of an ordinance universally esteemed a Sacrament in the Catholic Church? If MR. DALLAS was in possession of this fact, did he conceive, that, by observing silence upon it, other persons would not come to the knowledge of it? This impiety, then, was not only ascribed to BENZI by “ French and Italian Libels;” but even a Pope, the infallible head of the Holy Roman Church (who must be presumed to have possessed better means of information than mere Libels could have furnished, and who was not likely to have issued a decree upon no better authority than they afforded), entered a public Protest in the face of the world against such an abuse of what the Church at large regarded as one of her holiest rites. So far was the Pope from considering BENZI’s crime as only “ a *questio juris*,” or a mere “ technical opinion” on a case submitted to him, that he openly charged him with proclaiming the innocence and propriety of a practice which must excite the detestation and horror of every one, whose moral senses are not become completely obtuse! It is remarkable, that the Pope and his Council had no sooner published their condemnation, than the Jesuits, in defiance of the censure, printed a superior Edition of BENZI’s work at *Lucca*, and published it at a very cheap rate *.

Upon what ground, then, does MR. DALLAS venture on the assertion, that BENZI was “ far from teaching the horrors im-

* See (among other evidences) the *Manifesto of the King of Portugal addressed to the Bishops and Clergy of his Kingdom*, in proof of the above facts.

“puted to him?” by what perversion of terms does he choose to call such a man “respectable?”—and upon what grounds does he impute to “malice and calumny,” the censure which the accredited heads of the Romish Church felt it due to their own character, and to public morals, to proclaim against such a writer? A few remarks present themselves on the attempt which has thus been made by MR. DALLAS, to defend the above-named Casuists, and their pernicious doctrines and opinions, at the expense of truth and decency: a wise *Heathen* would have acted differently,

“Non ego mordosos ausim defendere mores!” OVID.

In the first place, it may be observed, that the course which he has taken will not surprise any persons who are acquainted with his former writings. In a work published by him in 1802, he writes thus of an *erroneous conscience*: “Those who think that the law which requires us to be faithful to our engagements is not obligatory towards HERETICS, “and that we may lawfully break it, in respect to them, have “an *erroneous conscience*. But what must we do in case of “an *erroneous conscience*? I answer, that WE OUGHT ALWAYS “TO FOLLOW THE DICTATES OF CONSCIENCE, EVEN WHEN IT “IS ERRONEOUS, AND WHETHER THE ERROR BE VINCIBLE “OR INVINCIBLE.”—See MR. DALLAS’s *Elements of Self-Knowledge*, part ii. chap. xviii. p. 201. Now, what is this but the Casuistry of the Jesuits? Upon this principle, there is not a single persecution which has vexed and wasted the Church of Christ, ever since Papal Rome has destroyed those whom she thought fit to call HERETICS, which may not be fully justified! If MR. DALLAS’s view of morals be correct, then the DUKE OF ALVA, the DUKES OF GUISE, and the POPES, who have delighted in Protestant blood, and the QUEEN who lighted up her fires throughout this kingdom, were not only innocent of all crime in what they did, but would have been guilty of a gross dereliction of duty if they had acted otherwise; since MR. DALLAS maintains, that there is a positive

and perpetual obligation upon us “ to follow the dictates of “ conscience” whether right or wrong: “ we ought,” says he, “ **ALWAYS** to follow the dictates of conscience, even when it is “ erroneous, and whether the error be **vincible** or **invincible**.” It was precisely upon this principle that **THOMAS PAINE** justified his blasphemies and impieties against revealed Religion. Let the answer which was given by the **BISHOP OF LANDAFF** to the infamous opinion of **PAINE** upon “ an erroneous con-“ science” suffice for an answer to **MR. DALLAS** also:

“ A fever” (says the Bishop), “ which you and those about “ you expected would prove mortal, made you remember, with “ renewed satisfaction, that you had written the former part of “ your **Age of Reason**—and you know therefore, you say, by “ experience, the conscientious trial of your own principles. “ I admit this declaration to be a proof of the sincerity of “ your persuasion, but I cannot admit it to be any proof of the “ truth of your principles. What is conscience? Is it, as “ had been thought, an internal monitor implanted in us by “ the Supreme Being, and dictating to us, on all occasions, “ what is right or wrong? Or is it merely our own judg-“ ment of the moral rectitude or turpitude of our own actions? “ I take the word (with Mr. Locke), in the latter, as in the “ only intelligible sense. Now, who sees not that our judg-“ ments of virtue and vice, right and wrong, are not always “ formed from an enlightened and dispassionate use of our “ reason, in the investigation of truth? They are more “ generally formed from the nature of the religion we profess; “ from the quality of the civil government, under which we “ live; from the general manners of the age, or the particular “ manners of the persons with whom we associate; from the “ education we have had in our youth; from the books we “ have read at a more advanced period; and from other acci-“ dental causes. Who sees not that, on this account, con-“ science may be conformable or repugnant to the law of “ nature?—may be certain, or doubtful?—and that it can be “ no criterion of moral rectitude, even when it is certain, be-

" cause the certainty of an opinion is no proof of its being a " right opinion? A man may be certainly persuaded of an " error in reasoning, or of an untruth in matters of fact. It " is a maxim of every law, human and divine, that a man " ought never to act in opposition to his conscience: but it " will not from thence follow, that he will, in obeying the dic- " tates of his conscience, on all occasions act right. An Inqui- " sitor, who burns Jews and Heretics; a Robespierre, who " massacres innocent and harmless women; a robber, who " thinks that all things ought to be in common, and that a " state of property is an unjust infringement of natural " liberty;—these, and a thousand perpetrators of different " crimes, may all follow the dictates of conscience; and may, " at the real or supposed approach of death, remember ' with " renewed satisfaction' the worst of their transactions, and " experience, without dismay, ' a conscientious trial of their " principles.' But this their conscientious composure can be " no proof to others of the rectitude of their principles, and " ought to be no pledge to themselves of their innocence, " in adhering to them." — See Watson's *Apology for the Bible*, p. 6.

The next remark which occurs on MR. DALLAS's defence of the Casuistry of the Jesuits is, that his attempt to exculpate the Jesuits from being *the original authors* of the detestable opinions which they have promulgated, will not avail him. It is not to be doubted, and may without hesitation be admitted, that the doctrines which the Jesuits have pushed to extremities were more or less inculcated by those members of the Romish communion who were *not* Jesuits, even before that Order had an origin. Such errors necessarily arose out of a corrupt and unscriptural faith, which produced, by a legitimate consequence, corrupt and unscriptural practices. The tree being radically bad, the fruits were bad also; and the scholastic theology which prevailed in the Church of Rome before Jesuitism had a being, was any thing but the Theology of the Bible. It may be also admitted that the same gross and

palpable errors have obtained in the Romish Church *since* the Order of Jesuits was instituted, even amongst those of her members who had no connexion with that Society, and were avowedly opposed to it. They did not indeed go to the same lengths which the Jesuits did, nor pursue the doctrines which they professed in common with the Jesuits to the same dangerous and destructive consequences; but they were equally professors of the same perverted and deteriorated religion, which, by an inevitable connexion, involved a course of practice, that was in direct opposition to the revealed will of God, and the best interests of man. If the members of that communion who had wisdom and courage enough to expose the corruptions of the Jesuits, had only proceeded a few steps farther than they did, they must have seen that the abominations which they opposed were not so much the vices of a particular class of men, as the vices of their own system; this indeed was a conclusion, to which if they had consented to come, they could no longer have continued in communion with a Church, which had so completely departed from the purity and simplicity of the Apostolic age: we find, accordingly, that some who did adopt that conclusion, openly quitted the bosom of a Church, where such abuses prevailed; while they who remained, not choosing to allow that their religion was in fault, attacked with peculiar acrimony the men who were foremost in propagating the opinions which necessarily arose out of their common creed. From this state of things, however, the greatest advantages have accrued to the cause of true religion: the dissensions which arose between the Jesuits and the Catholics have tended to elicit truths of the utmost importance; since they have served to develope the pollutions of Popery, both in doctrine and practice, in a way which perhaps would never otherwise have been exhibited. MR. DALLAS, however, has no right to claim any credit for the Jesuits, because they only contended for the errors which other men had proclaimed before, and which indeed were interwoven with the religious profession of other Catholics, as well as themselves; since the Jesuits were

in no wise less criminal because they were partakers of other men's sins of doctrine, and since they carried those doctrines into actual practices of regicide, rebellion, and impiety, which the less hardy professors of the same doctrines who preceded them, had been more generally content with asserting and arguing upon in Schools and Colleges.

In the next place it may be observed, that *the danger to Protestants*, from the revival of the Order of Jesuits, is only increased in an infinite degree, when it is considered that it is not from the Jesuits alone, as a peculiar and insulated body, that we have to apprehend the invasion of our own rights, and the risk of our own existence; since we have seen, from the admission of MR. DALLAS himself, that the pernicious doctrines of the Jesuits are by no means confined to that body, but that the same tenets are held by other members of the same Church, and, when brought into practical operation, can only lead to the same disastrous results.

If, therefore, it could be shewn that no cause of alarm exists on account of the Jesuits in England, yet, so long as the members of the same Church are daily increasing the number of their converts among us, and struggling with greater earnestness and ardour for the participation of power (if not for the exclusive possession of power) in this Protestant State; so long is it important that all who can think and reason, should consider the peril of conceding to those whose principles of Casuistry are in such strict unison with those of the Jesuits; that portion of political weight and influence which, under the fallacious and sophistical term of *EMANCIPATION*, they have persuaded themselves they ought to seek, and persuaded many among us they ought to obtain.

MR. DALLAS, in p. 69, with his accustomed incorrectness, quotes a passage in favor of the Jesuits as written by BAYLE, which BAYLE in fact quotes from another writer, namely, the author of *La Religion des Jesuites*, a work published at the Hague.—But MR. DALLAS omits, as usual, to give any part of BAYLE's statement which is unfavourable to the Jesuits, parti-

cularly the following passage : “ It is certain that some persons “ who do not appear to be prejudiced, maintain that many “ things have rendered the Society deservedly odious, and con- “ tend that such an extensive influence could never have been “ acquired, or so long maintained, without the aid of a very “ profound worldly policy.” Again, “ Have they not an Ency- “ clopedia of corrupted morals on the subject of Spiritual “ sins ? It is the Jesuits who have contended the most stren- “ uously for the consequences of many doctrines which were “ maintained before them, but pushed farthest by them ; doc- “ trines which expose Sovereigns to continual Revolutions, “ Protestants to carnage, and Christian morals to the most “ deplorable relaxation that can be imagined.”—See Bayle’s Dictionary; Art. LOYOLA ; and the Notes (R) and (S) *ibid.*

MR. DALLAS proceeds, in p. 71, to copy the Speech which has been attributed by the Jesuits to HENRY IV. at the time when his Parliament, with HARLAY, their First President, at their head, remonstrated against the reception of the Jesuits : of this Speech, however, that Monarch was perfectly guiltless. It was, in fact, written by the Jesuits themselves, and is a forgery of the most impudent character ! Its internal evidence, indeed, is sufficient for its conviction. Is it conceivable that any French gentleman, much more any Sovereign of France, could have made use of the following language ? “ *I am ac-“ quainted with things past, better than any person what-“ ever.*”—“ You set up for mighty statesmen, and understand “ state affairs no more than *I do the drawing the report of a* “ *cause.* Why not say, that your Daughters are as much reli- “ gious as the Nuns called here the Daughters of God, and that “ you are as much of my Order of the Holy Ghost, as my “ Knights and myself ?”—“ If the Sorbonne has condemned “ them, it was quite like you, without knowing them.”—“ It is “ objected, they get footing in cities and towns by all means they “ can : so do others : *I myself got into my kingdom as well as I* “ *could,*” &c. &c. Again—that part of the pretended Speech which makes Henry say of the two first assassins who at-

tempted his life (BARRIERE and CHATEL), " BARRIERE was " not encouraged by any Jesuit, CHATEL never accused them, " nor could any torments extort any charge against VARADE " or any other Jesuit," is so directly at variance with the important statements of DE THOU and SULLY, as well as so completely opposed to all the other accounts of those attempts on the life of HENRY IV. that it is impossible for any one who believes the concurrent testimony of the most faithful Historians to admit the genuineness of this Speech. With respect to BARRIERE and his instigator (the Jesuit VARADE), DE THOU and SULLY both agree that BARRIERE received his first instructions from the Jesuits of Lyons, who trained others as well as BARRIERE; and that without the Jesuit VARADE (who was Rector of the Jesuits' College at Paris), he would not have had the resolution to proceed with his scheme. It was VARADE who, in conjunction with a Paris Divine (not a Jesuit), encouraged BARRIERE, assuring him that HENRY's conversion to Popery was only pretended, and that the attempt on his life would be a deed which would merit salvation. VARADE, adding impiety to regicide, confessed BARRIERE, gave him absolution, and sent him to one of his brethren, to administer the Sacrament to him. The statement given by DE THOU is more circumstantial than that of SULLY. The former will be found in DE THOU's History, Lib. 107, n. 13; the latter, in SULLY's Memoirs, Vol. i. chap. 41, Edit. 1768. With regard to the attempt of CHATEL on the life of Henry IV. it may be remembered that SULLY was actually present at the time of that attempt; and his account of it has been already given in this Answer (p. 83). So much for the internal evidence supplied by this Speech, which tends to prove it a forgery; but, fortunately, we are not reduced to reason from its internal evidence alone; since DE THOU has satisfactorily shewn that the whole Harangue was no other than an invention of the Jesuits, and was never actually spoken. He produces the clearest proofs, that this Speech which was imputed to HENRY IV. first appeared in the Italian language at *Tournon*, but not

until a year after the interview between HENRY and his Parliament. “The King is made in it” (says DE THOU) “to cast many injurious reflections on the Parliament, *no one of which he ever uttered*, and to employ many puerile expressions in answer to things of which HARLAY had never thought.”—See *De Thou’s History*, book cxxxii. n. 4.

The Jesuits republished this supposed reply in the *Mercurie François*, Vol. ii. p. 170, and elsewhere: after which, the Jesuit MATTHIEU printed it in his History; the Jesuit DANIEL inserted it in his History of France; and POSSEVIN the Jesuit gave it a place in his *Bibliothèque*. The Jesuits also translated it into Latin and German.

A reference to that part of DE THOU’s History which has been already referred to, will shew with how much indignation, as well as with what complete success, that honest Historian refutes this fictitious answer. He assures us, that he was *himself present* when the King replied to HARLAY, and that he will pledge himself to the fidelity and accuracy of the statement he records, which is as follows: “The King replied” (says he) “to this Remonstrance with *much mildness*, and “thanked his Parliament in terms *full of affection* for the “zeal they had displayed for the safety of his person and the “interests of his Kingdom. With regard to the danger of “re-establishing the Jesuits, he appeared to feel little concern “upon that head, and answered dispassionately what had been “advanced on the subject. He said, that he had maturely “considered the matter, and had at length determined to “recal the Society which had been banished from the kingdom; that he hoped, in proportion as they had been considered criminal before, in the same degree they would strive “to evince their allegiance on their return; that, as to the “danger which was apprehended, he would be responsible for “it; that he had already surmounted greater by the grace of “God, and that he was desirous that every one should be at “ease on this head; that he watched over the safety of all his “subjects, and consulted their common interests; that a life of

" such trials as his own, had given him experience enough to
" communicate instruction to the most skilful in his kingdom;
" so that they might rely on him, with respect to his person
" and his empire; and that it was only for the welfare of
" others that he desired to preserve himself. He ended as he
" had begun, by once more thanking his Parliament for their
" zeal and their affection." Such is the account which is given
by DE THOU of the reply of HENRY IV. which *he himself*
heard delivered by that Monarch. How different to the ver-
bose and declamatory collection of vulgarisms invented by Ita-
lian Jesuits, republished by French Jesuits, and finally re-
copied by MR. DALLAS, after it had been repeatedly exposed
as a clumsy and contemptible forgery! and how much more
worthy of HENRY IV. is the Speech which is transmitted to us
by that faithful Historian DE THOU; in addition to whose
testimony as to the gross and palpable forgery of the Speech
attributed by the Jesuits to HENRY IV. the following works
establish the same fact, viz. *Recueil des Pièces sur l'Histoire du
Père Jouvency*, p. 112; and *La Morale pratique des Jesuites*,
Vol. iii. ch. 12.

It is the less necessary here to consider the motives which influenced HENRY to pursue so disastrous a policy as the recall of these enemies of his crown, his nation, and his life, since they are adverted to in the subsequent History: but, so far as the originality and authenticity of this particular document were concerned, it appeared essential to the interests of truth that MR. DALLAS should not be left in undisputed possession of such a weapon; since many persons might be disposed to attach importance to the Speech in connexion with the name of HENRY IV. to which it can lay no claim from any intrinsic merit which it possesses, there being no one solid argument in it in favor of the Jesuits, nor any effectual refutation of the arguments against them.

MR. DALLAS next attacks SIR JOHN COX HIPPISLEY, (p. 81); and, after some observations which are evidently intended to be humorous, complains of SIR JOHN, for having

maintained that the acknowledgment by Jesuits of a foreign General, is an instance of dependence upon foreign jurisdiction; a position, as it should seem, sufficiently incontrovertible, and such an one as perhaps might puzzle persons of greater ingenuity than even MR. DALLAS to disprove. That gentleman, however, in terms not the most civil or respectful towards a Member of the British Parliament, thinks proper to push this position to a consequence which he is pleased to term "absurd;" and having thus summarily disposed of it, he observes, that "the despotism of the General, and the blind obedience of the companions of the Order, are calumnies to which no man would be a dupe, who had ever cast his eye over the pages of the *religious and moral Statutes of the Institute*;" leaving it thus to be inferred (without stating it in so many words), that SIR JOHN knows nothing of those Statutes, and therefore is duped to believe the General despotic, and the Knights' Companions only so many slaves.

Perhaps MR. DALLAS may be disposed to consider SULLY as great a dupe as SIR JOHN HIPPISLEY. It is thus that SULLY had read the Statutes: "The first of their Statutes" (says he) "subjects them so blindly to their General, or rather to the Pope, that although they might personally entertain, on this point, the most correct and peaceful intentions, they can take no step without the concurrence of those two Superiors; of whom one, namely the Pope, can do us much injury, and the other, their General, is always a Spaniard by birth, or a creature of Spain: it is therefore impossible to suppose that the Pope and this General of the Jesuits can ever see the *Protestant* Religion flourish in France, under its own banners, with a favourable eye. The consequence must be, that the Jesuits, imbued with foreign maxims, adroit and intelligent as they are, and struggling for victory for their own party, will occasion a perpetual schism among the people by their confessions, their sermons, their books, and their conferences; from whence an injurious

" change will take place among the different members of the
" body politic, which will sooner or later lead to intestine
" war."—See Sully's Memoirs, Vol. v. p. 109, Edit. 1768.

MR. DALLAS then proceeds to reason upon SIR JOHN HIPPISLEY's objection as to foreign allegiance, and contends (p. 85) that " the obedience which all Religious as well as
" Jesuits paid to their chief Superior, who generally resided
" at Rome, was well understood to relate *merely to their professional duties* ;" after which, he observes, that the " native country of the Pope was never alledged as a motive for
" rejecting his authority."

Most certainly it never was, among his devotees or their defenders: but among all those Protestants who have understood the nature of Popery, and have been acquainted with their own interests, the allegiance due to the Pope by all Catholics; to the Superiors of Religious Orders, by the members of those Orders; and to the General of the Jesuits, by all the members of that Order—have been invariably protested against ever since the Pope, Religious Superiors, and the General of Jesuits, had an existence.

SIR JOHN HIPPISLEY, therefore, in objecting to the operation of foreign influence, and the admission of foreign supremacy in Protestant Empires, does no more than every Statesman may be expected to do, who knows what dangerous consequences have invariably flowed from the profession of such doctrines; and with regard to MR. DALLAS's assertion, that the obedience which all other Catholics, as well as Jesuits, paid to a foreign Superior, was well understood to relate merely to their "*professional duties*," MR. DALLAS must fail in establishing this point; unless he can persuade us to forget the Bulls and Decrees of various Popes, commanding the Catholic subjects of other Sovereigns, in all times, to depose and murder their lawful monarchs, and to stir up insurrection in their kingdoms; or unless he intends to designate those Papal mandates as so many calls to "*professional*

“duty,” and the obedience that was paid to those commands so many acts of “professional duty.”

MR. DALLAS’s taunting question, in p. 86, “Can SIR JOHN adduce a single instance of a Jesuit’s betraying the ‘country or the government which protected him?’” may be answered by informing him that the whole of this History (among many other works on the same subject) is a collection of such instances.

With regard to the question between SIR JOHN HIPPISLEY and MR. DALLAS as to the conduct of the EMPRESS OF RUSSIA, and her motives in protecting the Jesuits (see p. 87 et seq.), it may be observed, that her patronage of the Order no more proves it worthy of royal favor, than her invitation to D’ALEMBERT to come to Russia and educate the Grand Duke (which she accompanied with very flattering offers), proves that D’ALEMBERT deserved the confidence with which her Imperial Majesty’s misplaced taste for French genius and French profligacy would have led her to repose in him: neither does the good opinion which the KING OF PRUSSIA entertained of the Jesuits (see p. 88) any more prove that Order worthy of his good opinion, than the intimacy in which he lived with the worst Infidels of France proves Infidelity to be a good thing.

If Royal patronage would establish the advantages of the Order of Jesuits, MR. DALLAS might have found examples much better suited to his purpose, in the Popes who have employed Jesuits as their agents in every species of public crime, and in the Kings who have made them their Confessors and Confidants, in accomplishing the great work of enslaving their Catholic subjects, and destroying their Protestant subjects.

The utmost which the argument of authority can do for MR. DALLAS is, to prove what no man who knows any thing of the history of the world will dispute,—namely, that some Sovereign Princes have in all times fostered and employed designing men, under whose advice they have pursued measures entirely at variance with their own interests,

and with those of their people ; but this will not prove that the Sovereigns in question were worthy of imitation, or that the Instruments they employed were worthy of their confidence : the honours heaped upon the Jesuits by Catholic Monarchs, and the protection afforded to them by Philosophic Monarchs, will not invalidate the abundant testimony which we possess respecting their delinquencies ; nor will their reception by governments, either avowedly Catholic, or half Catholic, afford any argument for our *Protestant Government* confiding to them the education of its youth, or the instruction of its adults. MR. DALLAS, indeed, records, apparently with high satisfaction, the “unsuspecting liberality” with which his friends the Jesuits have been long treated in Russia ; makes honourable mention of the erection of their College of Polosk by the present Emperor, “into an University, “ by which they became exempted from the control of the “University of Petersburgh ;” and speaks of a Jesuitical “College of Nobles” in that Capital, where the Superior of Jesuits is pleased, very condescendingly, to permit a Priest of the Greek Church to explain on Sunday the National Catechism to these noble students, “*in a private room*,” beyond which, MR. DALLAS informs us, “he has nothing to do in the “house.”

It happens rather unfortunately for our author, that the Emperor of Russia should have altered his opinion about the Jesuits since MR. DALLAS’s Defence of the Order appeared ; but, perhaps, the Emperor did not read MR. DALLAS’s work. However this may be, that Monarch has already seen abundant occasion to regret the patronage he afforded, and the privileges he conceded, to these sworn foes of order and of peace ; and has found cause to repent of the education of the flower of his Nobility in the principles and mysteries of Jesuitism : he has accordingly driven the Jesuits in disgrace from both his Capitals ; and although the Popish Journal, or Orthodox Magazine, has thought fit to deny this fact, it is not less true on that account. From the commencement of his reign, the

Jesuits have proved themselves in Russia, as elsewhere, the sworn foes of every valuable institution: they have strenuously opposed the Bible Society, although well known to have enjoyed the particular auspices of the Emperor; and they resisted the printing of the Persian Testament in that Empire, although undertaken with his sanction: they have been indefatigable in their efforts to make converts to Popery, and have succeeded to a large extent, even in the most elevated classes: they carried on intrigues at Rome, which had for their object the dismemberment of the Greek Church, and the disgrace of its Clergy: they sought to excite the vengeance of the Pope against the chief supporters of the Bible Society in Russia; and but for the salutary overthrow they have experienced, would soon have succeeded in occasioning disturbances in that vast Empire, which it might have been found impossible to allay. Every person who maintains a correspondence with Russia may satisfy himself, without difficulty, of the correctness of this information.

It was not, indeed, to be expected, that these ministers of darkness would permit the diffusion of religious light without exerting all the opposition in their power, nor permit the continuance of concord, while they had the means of stirring up strife; but the example may not be without its use, if *other* Sovereigns besides the Emperor of Russia shall learn from it, that, unless ancient and modern History be the fiction which MR. DALLAS would represent, no Monarch who harbours the Jesuits must look for any special reservation in his own favor, or expect that the indulgences which he may concede to the Jesuits will be repaid by that Society in any other coin than that which has ever hitherto borne their “image and super-“scription.”

In p. 93 MR. DALLAS imputes to SIR JOHN HIPPISLEY the same motives with which he had charged the author of the *Brief Account of the Jesuits*, namely, an attack on the Catholics in general through the Jesuits; as if it were possible to separate the *two* cases, or at the same time to convict the

Jesuits, and to clear the Catholics: but this point has been so amply adverted to before, that it is the less necessary to consider it again.

MR. DALLAS (in p. 94) expresses his surprise at SIR JOHN's opinion, that modern Catholics (such as MR. PLOWDEN and others) must find some difficulty in condemning the wisdom of one Pope who suppressed the Order of Jesuits, while at the same time they applaud the wisdom of another Pope who has now restored it; but since it is impossible that these Pontiffs (however infallible some may consider them) can both be in the right, this really does appear to be a dilemma, upon one of whose horns, such inconsistent reasoners as these modern Catholics and their Defenders do voluntarily place themselves; and therefore there seems nothing unreasonable in the suggestion of SIR JOHN HIPPISLEY, that the Bull which abolished the Order, and the Bull which revived it, should always appear together, as the best exposure which plain Protestants can give of the contradictions of Catholic logicians, and the best refutation which they can afford to the claims of Papal Infallibility.

In the following page Mr. DALLAS speaks in contemptuous terms of two French works which have lately appeared against the Jesuits; the one entitled, *Du Pape et des Jesuites*; and the other, *Les Jesuites tels qu'ils ont été dans l'Ordre politique, religieux, et moral*; which works, however, he admits that he has *not read*: after which avowal he proceeds to state, that "their titles and authors are enough to convince "him that the new Conspiracy against the Jesuits extends to "France, and that he is answering those pamphlets WITHOUT "SEEING THEM."

There is something sufficiently ridiculous in this mode of judging of the merits of a work by its "Title" and its "Author:" but MR. DALLAS's alledged discovery of the art of answering a Book without seeing it, has been so long a desideratum in the learned world, and would be so important to the interests of the public at large, if it ever could be brought

into general use, that it is sincerely to be hoped this Gentleman will not (like the followers of ROSICRUSIUS) suffer such a secret to die with him; but will immediately communicate it, for the benefit of all poor authors, with whom Time is such a precious commodity, and more particularly, for the advantage of Reviewers.—How far, indeed, the manner in which MR. DALLAS has answered the *Brief Account of the Jesuits*, which he *has* read, will tend to recommend his answer to those books which he *has not* read, must be left for the Public to decide.

MR. DALLAS, in p. 97, enters upon a course of argument, which he pursues through several pages, the main object of which is to prove, that although GANGANELLI (CLEMENT XIV.) suppressed the Order of Jesuits, yet he was only induced to do so, partly from motives of policy, and partly of compulsion; and that such act was altogether opposed to his own private and personal convictions of the utility of the Order. “The Jesuits” (says MR. DALLAS) “were to be sacrificed in spite of their *innocence*, in spite of their *religious and moral virtues* (!!!), in spite of his own” (Clement’s) “attachment and approbation, to the necessity of preserving “the power of the Monarchs of Europe;” and MR. DALLAS then quotes abundantly from the work purporting to be the *Letters of Ganganelli*, for the purpose of shewing that, in suppressing the Order of Jesuits, this Pope acted under moral restraint, was not master of his own conduct, and would have followed a very different course if he had been able to obey the suggestions of his conscience. MR. DALLAS even compares this Pope to PONTIUS PILATE, for pursuing the policy of expediency; and quotes the Scriptures twice in one page to prove the similarity of character between the Roman Governor, who consented to the crucifixion of our Lord, and the Roman Pontiff, who consented to the suppression of the Jesuits. How far MR. DALLAS’s friends, the Roman Catholics, will thank him for his parallel, will remain for them to determine.

Unfortunately for MR. DALLAS, all the reasoning by which he arrives at the conclusion that Pope CLEMENT XIV. abolished the Order of Jesuits contrary to his own convictions, is founded upon a work which has been long and universally disavowed as authentic, both by the Religious and Literary world, namely, GANGANELLI'S LETTERS. It is only the part of charity to presume, that MR. DALLAS was ignorant of the general understanding and belief respecting these Letters, and to conclude that he never would have consented to reason upon such materials, if he had not supposed them to be genuine: in this case his defective information alone will become the subject of censure; and it is far better that a writer should be convicted of resorting to a modern forgery in ignorance of its nature, than that he should have called in its aid under a consciousness of its falsehood. MR. DALLAS, therefore, shall have all the benefit which he can derive from this concession: though, after all, it must be admitted, that an author who professes to inform the British Public upon a point so essential to their interests, cannot be too careful to be well-informed himself upon the character of his authorities. The question raised in France respecting these Letters is well known, and has never yet been answered—"WHERE ARE THE ORIGINALS?" In urging that question, and in demonstrating the fraud which was attempted to be put upon the world by the publication of these Letters, VOLTAIRE, perhaps, was most successful; nor can the general Infidelity of that writer be mixed with this question, as any reason for rejecting his aid in detecting imposture, since the question is simply one of fact, namely, whether GANGANELLI did or did not write the Letters attributed to him after his death. If a man gives such information as may preserve our House from plunder, we do not object to him the unsoundness of his religious principles as a reason for discrediting his testimony. DR. JOHNSON was so perfectly convinced that these Letters were a forgery, that he asserted his conviction in the most unequivocal terms (see Boswell's Life, Vol. iii. p. 308, Edit. 1799):

indeed, the learned world has been long agreed in the same view of the subject; and these Letters are now almost universally regarded as the composition of CARACCIOLI.

The clumsy defence inserted by Messieurs the Editors and Booksellers in their Preface to the later Editions, in answer to those objectors who had very naturally inquired after the sources whence these Letters were obtained, is rendered sufficiently ridiculous by the pompous mystery which it affects. “As this” (say they) “is a matter of confidence, “and the persons from whom we received them are unwilling “to appear, we are by no means entitled to break the seal of “secrecy, under which they were intrusted to our hands.” They had, indeed, the best reason in the world for not producing the persons from whom they pretended to have received them; but it is probable these worthy Editors had never met with the maxim, “*De non apparentibus, et non existentibus, eadem est ratio.*”

The evidence, therefore, to be derived from these fabricated Letters, as opposed to the great public and solemn act of the Pontificate of CLEMENT XIV. cannot be admitted to have any weight; and with regard to MR. DALLAS’s suggestion (p. 104), that in suppressing the Order by a *Brief*, CLEMENT chose to adopt that mode, because it was not usual to consult the Cardinals in issuing that form of mandate, it may be replied,—that, so far was CLEMENT from acting without the advice and authority of his brethren, that he took four years to deliberate upon the matter before he acted, in which space of time he referred the consideration of it to a commission, composed of five Cardinals, and of several Prelates and Advocates: he searched himself the Archives of the Propaganda, for the Documents relative to the Missions of the Jesuits; considered the accusations brought against the Society, and the apologies in its favor; and read every publication of importance on the subject, whether for or against the Order. He went farther: anxious to be correct as well in the manner, as in the matter, of his judicial condemnation, he communicated

his Brief, privately, to several Cardinals and Theologians before it was promulgated, as well as to some Sovereigns who were interested in the fate of the Order, and to others who were more indifferent parties; and he at length determined upon the measure of its extinction, not without the fullest consideration of the consequences of the act, both to the world and to himself. He believed that it would be useful to mankind, but he did not doubt that it would cost him his life. His remarks, after signing this instrument, were: "The suppression is accomplished. I do not repent of it, having only resolved on it, after examining and weighing every thing, and because I thought it necessary for the Church: if it were not done, I would do it now; but *this suppression will be my death*—(*ma questa soppressione mi dara la morte*)."

The initial letters of a Pasquinade appeared at this time on St. Peter's Church, which CLEMENT himself interpreted to mean "*the Holy See will be vacant in September*." His death was attended with every symptom of poison: his throat, stomach, and intestines were in a state of the highest inflammation; and immediately on his death his whole body turned black, his flesh fell off, and he became so offensive, although remarkably thin, that it was impossible to approach him. There can be no reasonable doubt that CLEMENT XIV. died by poison, and there can be as little doubt at whose instance it was administered. Another attempt had been made in the month of April, 1774, to destroy him by the same means; but it was not until the end of June in that year, that his enemies succeeded in their object. The attestations of the Physician SALICETTI, to prove that his death proceeded from natural causes, were generally discredited, and he was universally believed to have been influenced by certain parties interested in perverting the truth *.

Whether, therefore, CLEMENT XIV. was right or wrong

* The above facts are taken from the LIFE OF GANGANELLI printed in 1776.

in suppressing the Jesuits, he was at least sincere. If we may rely on the best sources of information, hypocrisy formed no part of his character; the attempt, therefore, of MR. DALLAS to extract from the Letters which have been ascribed to CLEMENT, any evidence to shew that he was personally attached to the Society, and that he abolished it in opposition to his better judgment, must needs fall to the ground; nor will his assertion (in p. 109) avail him any better, where he informs us that throughout the whole Brief of Suppression, CLEMENT, “*does not once advance an opinion of his own adverse to “the Society.”*”

The same observation, indeed, occurs in a work, entitled, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclesiastique pendant le dix-huitième Siècle*; where it is observed, “*Le Pape ne porte “point de jugement à l'égard de tout ce dont on les accusoit;*” and MR. DALLAS has probably taken his hint from thence.

It is only necessary to observe upon such a remark, from whatever source it may proceed, that the whole tenour and object of the Brief of Suppression completely refutes it; since that document contains an abstract of the History of the Jesuits, so far as regards the various public condemnations of the Society by several Popes who had preceded CLEMENT: all which censures having been found (as he expressly declares) utterly inadequate to the end they had proposed, he resolves to adopt the only effectual means, by laying the axe to the root of the tree, and abolishing such a Society altogether.

If this be not a tolerably explicit statement of an adverse opinion, it is not very easy to divine what MR. DALLAS would consider such.

In a note to p. 109, MR. DALLAS denies that the Jesuits were connected with THE INQUISITION, with the same confidence as if he had really the means of disproving that connexion.

The passage in the *Brief Account of the Jesuits*, which gave rise to this denial, was as follows (p. 15): “*One peculiar object of the Society, is to direct and aid the operations*

“ of the Inquisition where it exists, and to exercise its several
 “ functions secretly in countries where it is not established,
 “ particularly with reference to the governments of those
 “ countries; and one of the first acts of XAVIER on landing
 “ at GOA, was to establish the Inquisition there; an Institu-
 “ tion whose great object we know to be, the discovery and
 “ punishment of Heretics, or, as we should call them, Pro-
 “ testants, *and which the same Pope who has revived the*
 “ *Order of Jesuits, has therefore with perfect consistency*
 “ *re-established.*”

With regard to the *public* connexion, which has always subsisted, and must ever continue to subsist, between the Jesuits and THE INQUISITION; it is the less necessary to dwell upon this point, because (to say no more of their great apostle XAVIER having actually established the Inquisition of GOA) there is no account of the Inquisition, either ancient or modern, in whatever countries it may have existed, in which the Jesuits are not proved to have been (in conjunction with the Dominicans, and others) active and cruel members of that bloody tribunal of tyranny and oppression *: but as their *secret* exercise of Inquisitorial functions, in countries where that monstrous engine of injustice does not exist, is perhaps less known, a single Extract shall be adduced to establish it.

The apology of GERSON the Jesuit contains the following avowal: “ Inasmuch” (says he) “ as, from the nature of their Institute and their fourth vow, it belongs to the Jesuits to exercise the office and functions of Inquisitors, in countries where no Inquisition is established, as appears from the Bull granted by PAUL III. in the year 1549, in favor

* See, among other works, DELLON’S *Account of the Inquisition at Goa*. THE BISHOP OF ANGELOPOLIS, also, in his Letter to POPE INNOCENT X. speaking of the persecution which he and his Clergy experienced from the Jesuits, observes, “ They employed at the same time the jurisdiction of Inquisitors, who, under pretence that the people of my Diocese cared little about Excommunication, imprisoned many of the Laity who resisted them, and threatened them with still rougher treatment if they would not submit.”

“ of the Jesuits *:”—and he then proceeds to shew their mode of putting Kings on their trial among themselves, and employing their devotees to execute their intentions of destroying them.

MR. DALLAS, in p. 113 et seq. examines SIR JOHN HIPPISLEY’s objection to Jesuits going abroad for Ordination; and observes, that “ SIR JOHN does not appear aware that in an “ Order, it is requisite to obtain Ordination through a Superior of the Order:” after which, he states that SIR JOHN must be aware, that “ no Priest of the regulars can assume “ any exercise of ministerial functions, in preaching or administering sacraments, without license of the diocesan prelate.” He then gives a confused account of two Ecclesiastical Students, who went to Palermo in 1806, for their health, but were not allowed to officiate as Priests, and on recovering their health returned home: he next informs us, that in three ensuing years one Priest and ten Students went to Palermo. The whole result of this statement is, that, instead of nineteen, there were only nine who obtained Orders, one of whom (says MR. DALLAS) “ is the distinguished President of the new Seminary of Education in Ireland.” He adds, “ for the last six years not one Catholic Student has had a thought of following their example:” and he concludes this branch of his argument, by observing, that “ such trifling emigrations of a few Students will neither alarm nor surprise those who know that, for more than two Centuries, the penal laws have driven all English and Irish Catholics, who were not content to live in ignorance at home, to seek education abroad; that this had become an invariable custom, and that every year scores of British subjects went abroad.”

MR. DALLAS appears to be deeply versed in all the art

* “ Siquidem Jesuitis ex naturâ sui Instituti et quarti voti, incumbit, officio Inquisitorum defungi iis in Provinciis ubi Inquisitoris officium nequaquam institutum est, ut patet ex Bullis Pauli III. anno 1549, editis pro Jesuitarum Instituto,” &c. *Apolog. pro Gerson*, p. 198 et seq.

and mystery of Popish Ordination; but to what does this profound respect for the regular and irregular Orders of the Papacy amount? If MR. DALLAS succeeds in proving that Catholics have no need to go abroad for ordination, because, by a strange contradiction, such ample provision for ordaining Popish Priests is now made in the heart of our Protestant nation, that they may obtain ordination here; will this prevent their going abroad for the same purposes of sedition and rebellion, as have ever hitherto connected them with the Continent? But let us suppose them to emigrate no more. If Ireland, that vulnerable heel of the British Achilles, is still to continue the nursery of Popery, and therefore the hot-bed of disaffection and disorder, will it be any consolation to MR. DALLAS's Protestant Readers to learn, that the Romish Priesthood may be preserved in all its integrity without emigrations to Italy? So long as Bishops of the Catholic Church may ordain Priests, in any number, in England and Ireland, and so long as Superiors of the Order of Jesuits may make members of that Order in either country, MR. DALLAS must not expect to remove our just apprehension of the consequences of such privileges, by gravely informing us—that Ecclesiastical Students will no longer emigrate to Italy and elsewhere; but that they intend to favor us with their company in perpetuity, since it is utterly impossible that they can at the same time pay a foreign allegiance, and love a nation of Heretics.

MR. DALLAS's flattering compliment (p. 116) to the person whom he is pleased to call “the distinguished President “of the new Seminary of Education in Ireland,” may lose a little of its value, when the public come to be informed that this Seminary is no other than the Establishment of Jesuits at CASTLE BROWNE, which received £30,000 for its foundation; which maintains a constant communication, on the one hand, with the Jesuits’ College at Stonyhurst, near Preston in Lancashire, and, on the other, with Spain, Italy, and France; that this Irish College of Jesuits is daily increasing in extent; that it educates all the youths it can obtain, and, in particular,

has had the honour of training some of the sons of the principal political Agitators of Ireland. No wonder that Emigration is out of fashion in Ireland, when such Education as this may be obtained without the risk of crossing the Seas! no wonder, that, with such “distinguished Presidents,” the holy work of insurrection and rebellion should advance in Ireland, with so much spirit and success!

With regard to MR. DALLAS's assertion, that, “for more than two Centuries, the penal laws have driven all English and Irish Catholics who were not content to live in ignorance at home, to seek education abroad;” this is, in the first place, no great compliment to the learning and talents of those Catholics who do not happen, in that space of time, to have had their education abroad; and, in the next place, it is a foul slander on those members of the Protestant communion, who, without going abroad at all, have been enabled to obtain such an education in the United Kingdom, as has qualified them to adorn the various stations they have occupied. If, indeed, by the word “*Education*” MR. DALLAS intends an education in polities as well as in science, in rebellion as well as in religion, there is an end of the argument; since it is not disputed, that, in order to the perfection of the clerical character in the Romish Church, certain other doctrines must be acquired in the course of education, besides those which are more immediately connected with the sacerdotal profession.

We find MR. DALLAS next protesting (p. 116) against SIR JOHN HIPPISLEY's proposal, that the large sum of money which has been devoted to the endowment of the Jesuits' Seminary in Ireland, should be appropriated to the Establishment for Educating Roman Catholic Priests at Maynooth.

What SIR JOHN has promised himself by this transfer of property, it is not indeed very easy to discover. That such a diversion of the fund would be more in unison with the mistaken and fatal error into which the British Legislature has permitted itself to fall, in harbouring and cherishing within its own bosom, the natural and eternal enemies of its own exist-

ence and repose, may be readily conceded *: and it may be also admitted, that if the sum of £30,000, or any annual Parliamentary grants, must necessarily be devoted, either to the support of Romish Priests or Jesuits, any man would choose the least of two evils, and prefer that the former should receive the money rather than the latter; but if the views which have been taken throughout this Answer should prove correct, all honest men who wish to live in peace, must surely deprecate pecuniary grants to either of these objects; nor will it appear to them a matter of much consequence, whether the money is remitted to Catholic Priests, or to their sworn friends, advisers, and colleagues, the Jesuits.

If to this it should be replied, that the Jesuits and the Priests have by no means always preserved the relations of amity; it may be answered, that, however they may have differed at other times, they have never failed to merge their mutual animosities, and to make common cause, when it was a question between THEMSELVES and THE PROTESTANTS: thus, we read that when our Saviour was to be destroyed, “the same day PILATE and HEROD were made friends together; “for, before they were at enmity between themselves” (Luke, ch. xxiii. ver. 12); and we know that the Romans forgot their bitterest quarrels, whenever *Carthage* was mentioned.

Before the subject of the Jesuits’ College at Castle Browne is quitted, it may be asked whether MR. DALLAS, when he exalts this, as a Seminary for general learning (p. 117), seriously imagines that his readers will not distinguish between “general learning,” and the utter abuse of learning, above all, of sacred learning, which has ever charac-

* It is utterly inconceivable upon what principle a *Protestant Legislature* can involve itself in such contradiction and inconsistency, as thus to foster within its own bosom, the viper which is preparing to inflict the sting of death upon its patron and protector: the support of the College of Maynooth is an anomaly in Legislation, at the bare proposal of which our ancestors, who were better acquainted with the genius and character of Popery than we are, would have started with horror! “Quousque pascetis ignigenos istos?”—Apuleii Metam. I. 7.

terized the learning of the Jesuits? and whether he really expects that the specious phrase of “general learning” is so far to besot our judgments, and fascinate our affections, that we are determined to provide for its promulgation, though it be no better, after all, than the inculcation of the corruptions and errors of Popery, embellished and relieved, at the same time, with some such aids and advantages of secular learning as may render them more palatable and less repulsive than when viewed in their naked grossness and deformity? MR. DALLAS, indeed, is very solicitous to keep out of sight the main fact of this seminary of learning being a seminary of *Jesuits*; one part of whose doctrinal system is the diffusion of a Religion which Protestants deny to be the Religion of the Bible, while the other part of their system inculcates such political principles as Englishmen deny to be consistent with the security of their own Constitution.

We come now to the authorities cited by MR. DALLAS in favor of the Jesuits (p. 123).

The first is that of the EMPRESS CATHERINE OF RUSSIA, of whose evidence in favor of the Jesuits something has already been said. MR. DALLAS begins by asserting, that the good people of Mohiloff in Russia “were very much attached “to the Order of Jesuits;” he then proceeds to state, that the Empress received and favored the Jesuits in her dominions; but he takes care to observe a profound silence upon the motive which has been generally ascribed to CATHERINE for the asylum she afforded to the proscribed Order of Jesuits, and of which he could hardly be uninformed—namely, her confident hope and expectation that the Jesuits of Europe and America would bring into White Russia their ill-gotten gain, and enrich her empire by their wealth and industry. The spoils of PARAGUAY, however, never found their way to MOHILOFF.

Whether the absolute despotism and the subtle policy of the Empress might not have prevented the Jesuits from effecting the same mischief in Russia latterly, as they had achieved there in an earlier period of their history, may form a problem

for the students in political learning; but it may be confidently affirmed, that the patronage of the Order of Jesuits by such an Empress as Catherine, in such an Empire as Russia, affords no example for the imitation of England or her Monarch. She was justly accused of being, not only a most licentious and abandoned woman, but even of murdering her husband:—the despot of her own subjects, and the oppressor and subjugator of Poland; herself absolutely without Religion, and placed by her birth over an Empire whose national Religion bears a near affinity, in many of its doctrines, and most of its ceremonies, to that of the Church of Rome:—such a woman finds herself disposed (no matter from what motives of worldly policy) to extend her favor to the Order of Jesuits! Does this circumstance afford any better argument for the Order than the protection vouchsafed to them in every period of their history by intriguing Popes, by imbecile Monarchs, or by corrupt Ministers? Such patronage can only be ranked in the same class, and weighed in the same scale, with other acts of weakness and folly which (in Catholic countries especially) have at once disgraced the councils of Princes, and brought affliction upon their subjects. Nor will the exemption of Russia for the last thirty years from “religious or civil broils” (as boasted by MR. DALLAS) by any means prove that the Jesuits have changed either their principles or conduct; since, for twenty-nine years of that period, the Jesuits in Russia have been acting under the peculiar disadvantages arising out of the suppression of the Order elsewhere, and for the greater part of that period were under the government of a woman who, with all her vices of ambition and sensuality, must be allowed to have had as keen an eye upon her own interests as any Sovereign who ever reigned. It may be affirmed, therefore, without the hazard of refutation, that the history of the Jesuits in Russia, under the Empress Catherine, affords no precedent for their encouragement in England; the cases of the two countries being in no way analogous, and consequently the argument

drawn from their reception by her, being invalid as affecting ourselves.

It has, indeed, been asserted, that the vices of the late Empress supply no reason for rejecting the evidence in favor of the Jesuits which her patronage afforded: and that argument is quite consistent, when used by such Defenders of the Order as MR. DALLAS, who either do not see, or will not admit, that the vices of the Jesuits *themselves* afford any good evidence against them; but in a country where moral probity holds so high a rank as in our own, this consideration will have its weight, nor can all the sophistry of those who defend or deny the recorded iniquities of this Order, or of its royal and literary Patrons, weaken its force.

But further: MR. DALLAS gives a Letter of the Empress of Russia to the Pope in favor of the Jesuits, from CASTERA's History of Catherine II.; although it appears from that very History that the Empress herself positively disavowed this Letter in the Gazette of St. Petersburgh of the 20th April, 1783 (see CASTERA, Vol. ii. p. 323). If, indeed, the Letter had been authentic, MR. DALLAS was bound to have presented it as it appears in CASTERA; but he omits the last paragraph for obvious reasons. That paragraph runs thus: "Who " knows whether Providence may not design these pious men " as the instruments of uniting *the Greek Church with the Catholic?* an union which has been so long desired. Let " Your Holiness dismiss all apprehension, for I will maintain " with all my power *the rights which you have received from Jesus Christ.*" Now, as Mr. DALLAS knew that the Protestants of England did not desire that the Jesuits should be a medium of reconciliation between the Reformed Church and the Church of Rome, and as he knew, also, that the King of England did not mean to maintain, with all his power, the rights of the Pope; he perceived, at once, that the want of analogy between the cases of Russia, under Catherine II. and of England, under George III. would be too striking: he therefore does not permit this concluding paragraph of the Empress's

supposed Letter to the Pope to appear; but gives, as in other cases, just so much of the Letter as suits his purpose, and no more. Again: MR. DALLAS, even with CASTERA's book before him, ventures to assert, that "the placing of the Jesuits in her dominions was a proof of the *sagacity* of Catherine;" and adds, "I doubt whether Russia was ever more indebted to any Sovereign than for this step, which was at once magnanimous, wise, and popular;" while, in the very same page of CASTERA, from which MR. DALLAS had been quoting the Empress's pretended Letter, the following passage appears: "Perhaps the Empress only attached so much importance to the negotiation, because she flattered herself that all the Jesuits of Europe and America would bring their treasures and their industry into White Russia: but whatever her hopes might be, the plunder of PARAGUAY never found its way to MOHILOFF. The Jesuits were too cunning to place themselves and their wealth in the hands of a Princess with whose despotism and insatiable ambition they were well acquainted." We have here, therefore, first, the worldly policy of CATHERINE in desiring the return of the Jesuits pretty distinctly announced; and we have, secondly, an allegation that they were too wise to accept her offer: consequently, the vast advantages accruing to the Empire of Russia from such a *magnanimous, wise, and popular* step, never had any other place than in the fertile imagination of MR. DALLAS, who takes care to quote no more of CASTERA's History than would have established his own object, provided no one had looked at the History besides himself.

POPE CLEMENT XIII. is the next authority cited by MR. DALLAS in favor of the Jesuits, and he gives, at the end of his work, a translation of his principal Bull in their favor: a Bull which his Successor CLEMENT XIV. affirms (in the Bull which suppresses the Order) was *extorted from* CLEMENT XIII. by the Jesuits, rather than *obtained* ("literæ extortæ potius quam obtentæ"). Whether this was the fact or not, we are little concerned to know; MR. D. is at full liberty to take all the benefit

which he can derive from this Bull, or any other. There is a great store of this pontifical machinery for his selection: the collection of Bulls obtained by the Jesuits in their favor, all breathe the same language, and are equally suited to MR. DALLAS's purpose, with the Bull of CLEMENT XIII.; but, however he may have studied and admired these ecclesiastical compositions, does he believe that those of the people of England who have ever considered the question of their own religion and their own history, are likely to be duped and deluded by Bulls granted by the Popes in favor of the Jesuits? The utmost to which the citation of this authority goes, is to shew that CLEMENT XIII. committed as great an error as many of his infallible Predecessors; but so far from this being any reason why those persons who deny their authority, and dispute their wisdom, should go wrong also, it is the very reason, of all others, for their taking a contrary course. Of GANGANELLI, the successor of CLEMENT XIII. (who is MR. DALLAS's next authority), perhaps enough has been said, as well as of those fabricated Letters which it has answered the purpose of the Booksellers to publish, and of MR. DALLAS to quote, under his name. If MR. DALLAS had succeeded in setting up these Letters, of which GANGANELLI was not the author, against the Bull suppressing the Jesuits, of which he was the author, the only advantage lie would have derived from this success would have been, to shew that a Pope, as well as meaner men, may entertain two different opinions, at different times. As all authentic evidence, however, is against his having thought in any way favorably of the Jesuits, either before he became a Pope, or afterwards, MR. DALLAS's placing him "among the authorities in favor of the Jesuits," upon the mere gratuitous assumption of his having written the Letters ascribed to him, only affords another example of the untenable ground which he is compelled to occupy in the support of a sinking cause.

The next authority for the Jesuits is the President D'EGUILLES (p. 133), to whom an opinion is ascribed in favor

of the Society, without our being informed from what book that opinion was extracted, or in what part of the book it appears. Admitting it to be true, that this personage said just what "is set down for him," the opinion can only take rank with the favorable sentiments of other good Catholics in support of their brethren the Jesuits.

The same may be also said of the opinion of the Abbé PROYART, cited in p. 135; unless, indeed, it should appear, as has been strongly suspected by many, and loudly asserted by others, that the worthy *Abbé* himself was not a simple Catholic, but a *Jesuit*.

In the same page we find VOLTAIRE (*mirabile dictu!*) classed among the friends of the Jesuits, after he had been charged by MR. DALLAS with anxiously seeking their destruction, because they were the chief supports of religion and monarchy, both which, he himself opposed. When the Defender of a Religious Order is compelled to resort to such an authority as that of VOLTAIRE in its support, it seems high time to abandon its defence altogether. A blasphemer upon so large a scale as VOLTAIRE—a creature of such unparalleled profligacy in his conduct, can only disgrace that Order which takes shelter under the sanction of his name, unless its own vices should already have reduced it so low as to place it out of danger of falling lower. Surely it would have been prudent in MR. DALLAS to have suppressed the fact which he records, of VOLTAIRE *having received his education in a College of Jesuits!*

We have next the authority of MONTESQUIEU for the Jesuits (p. 137): and, as usual, MR. DALLAS gives us just as much of what MONTESQUIEU has said as serves his purpose, but no more. The Chapter from which MR. DALLAS quotes a few sentences which favor the Jesuits, if taken *altogether*, will be found to convey the most severe reflection on their corrupt and worldly policy.

The Chapter in question (book iv. chap. 6) is intended to describe certain extraordinary Institutions in the govern-

ment of nations ; and MONTESQUIEU, who, so long as an effect appeared to be produced, was (like the Jesuits) not very scrupulous about the means which were employed, thus describes those Institutions : " I request attention" (says he) " to the extent of genius which these Legislators (LYCORGUS " and PLATO) must have possessed, to discover, that, in violating all established usages, and in confounding all the virtues, they would display their wisdom to the world. LYCORGUS gave stability to his City by uniting theft with the spirit of justice, the most rigorous slavery, with the greatest liberty, and the most atrocious opinions, with the greatest moderation : he seemed to deprive his City of all the resources of the arts of commerce, wealth, and fortifications ; there was ambition without the hope of advancement, and the sentiments of nature without the characters of child, husband, or father ; even shame itself was taken away from Chastity : it was by these means, that SPARTA was conducted to greatness and glory."

After stating in what parts of Greece these laws prevailed, and with what difficulty the nations who were governed by them were conquered, he proceeds to remark: " This extraordinary character, observable in the Institutions of Greece, has been displayed in the dregs and corruption of modern times. An honest Legislator has formed a people among whom probity appears as natural, as bravery among the Spartans. PENN is a true LYCORGUS ; and although peace was the object of the former, and war of the latter, they resemble each other in the singular method of treating their people, in the ascendancy they have possessed over free men, in the prejudices they have surmounted, and the passions they have subdued. PARAGUAY *furnishes us with another example.* It has been imputed to the Society (of Jesuits) " as a crime, that they considered the pleasure of governing as the chief good of life ; but" (here MR. DALLAS's quotation begins) " it will ever be a glorious ambition to govern men by rendering them happy," &c. MR. DALLAS,

in proceeding with the quotation, skips over the following passage as not very favorable to his friends the Jesuits: “ *The “zeal of the Society for a Religion which humbles those who “hear it, much more than those who preach it, has made it “undertake great things, and it has succeeded.”* ”

Now, taking the whole of the above extract together, it is evident that MONTESQUIEU meant to compare the exertions of the Jesuits, in the dregs of modern times, with those of the Heathen Legislators LYCURGUS and PLATO. It is true that he praises the Jesuits, and so he does their Pagan predecessors; but for what? — for accomplishing their object of governing by measures of the most subtle and corrupt policy: he expressly instances the Jesuits as imitators and followers of the Grecian Legislators, who “ displayed their wisdom “to the world by violating established usages, and con-“founding every virtue.” Well might an inspired Apostle declare, that “ the world by wisdom knew not God!” MONTESQUIEU further remarks, that the Jesuits afford a proper example in modern times of those ancients who united theft with justice, slavery with licentiousness, and atrocious opinions with great moderation: all this ancient and modern contempt for reason and revelation may present a very fine picture to the eye of this philosophic Catholic, MONTESQUIEU, who, in observing the near approaches which the Jesuits have made to the perfection of Heathenism, discovers much to admire and commend. Perhaps the Public may see rather less, when they have thus before them *the whole* of his views upon the subject; and they may probably see farther occasion to distrust a writer who, when affecting to give the opinion of MONTESQUIEU upon the Jesuits, selects from that opinion just so much as suits him, and leaves the rest.

We next find BUFFON adduced as a witness in favor of the Jesuits (p. 138).

All who are in the slightest degree acquainted with the character of BUFFON, will be not a little surprised at finding his authority referred to, upon any question of morals; and will

wonder not without cause, what he could know of the religion or morality of the Jesuits. The merit of deep investigation into the philosophy of merely animal nature, cannot indeed be denied to BUFFON; but with respect to that moral monster the Jesuit, he was the last man whose opinion is worth possessing: at once the greatest sensualist, and the greatest student of his age; his whole time was divided between his vices and his writings. The grossness of his conversation obliged ladies of any character, even when they were his own guests, to withdraw from his table, that they might escape from his indelicate and licentious observations. During the life of his wife, he was charged with frequent infidelities, and he proceeded to the unwarrantable extreme of debauching young women, and then employing means to procure abortion.

His confidence in the latter period of his life, was almost wholly engrossed by a *Mademoiselle Blesseau*, who lived with him for many years. Of his infidelity, his works afford ample evidence; and it was this which suggested to him, that immortal renown was the most powerful of death-bed consolations. In his contempt for Religion, he added hypocrisy to impiety, attending with regularity the external observances of religion, under pretence that as there must be a religion for the multitude, we should avoid giving offence. "I have always" (he said) "named the Creator, but it is only putting, mentally, in "its place, the energy of nature, which results from the two "great laws of attraction and impulse*." When the *Sorbonne* "molested me, I gave all the satisfaction which they solicited: "it was only a form that I despised, but men are weak enough "to be satisfied with forms. For the same reason, when I fall "dangerously ill, I shall not hesitate to send for the Sacraments. "This is due to the public religion. They who act otherwise "are madmen."—Yet gross as this hypocrisy was, as to externals, BUFFON never permitted it to interfere with his personal vices, which he practised to the last, with an obdurate

* "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools!" Romans, ch. i. ver. 22.

and unfeeling profligacy, that has probably never been exceeded; the debauching of female children forming his constant and his last delight!

He never fails to allude to sensual gratifications in his works, and never lost sight of them in his practice*. Yet this is the man to whom one of his countrymen (*Herault de Sechelles*) dared to apply the epithets of “great and good;” and this too is the man, whom MR. DALLAS selects as an evidence in favor of the Jesuits!

MR. DALLAS must not hope to shelter himself under the plea that BUFFON’s impieties and immoralities have nothing to do with this question. They are essentially connected with it, because it is *evidence to moral character*, which BUFFON gives, and which MR. DALLAS quotes; and it then becomes of importance to ascertain whether the person who gave this evidence had any moral character of his own. It is one thing when a man writes respecting animals, minerals, or vegetables; and another when he ventures upon higher ground, treats of Morals, and eulogizes a Religious Order. The opinion of a Philosopher may be very correct upon the secondary causes of Thunder and Lightning; but if the same Philosopher were boldly to deny the God who was the great primary cause of these appearances, we should without hesitation reject his evidence, upon a question of religion and morality. Thus the Philosopher in question, who virtually rejected the Revelation which God had given to the world, could be expected to know but little of the way in which the Jesuits had adhered to, or departed from it, either in the doctrines they taught, or the practices they observed.

The next authority is that of HALLER (p. 139), and has chiefly reference to the Missions of the Jesuits, which will be considered hereafter.

The authority of HALLER is succeeded by that of MURATORI, the Italian Scholar and Antiquary, who also speaks to

* See, in proof of the above facts, Rees’s and Brewster’s Cyclopedias, and Chalmers’s Biographical Dictionary, with their authorities.

the Missions of the Jesuits, in the Extract which is given; and he again is followed by GROTIUS, LEIBNITZ, and BACON, a Triumvirate, who are somewhat unceremoniously lumped together.

We then come to the Evidence supplied in favor of the Jesuits by the Infidel friend and ally of the Atheists, Deists, and Sceptics of the French Revolution, FREDERIC OF PRUSSIA; whom MR. DALLAS, notwithstanding, honours with the epithet of THE GREAT, a title which other splendid villains, and mighty conquerors, have shared in common with him, from the foundation of the world.

The opinion of DR. JOHNSON, which follows in p. 144, requires a little more examination.

MR. DALLAS is perfectly welcome to all the benefit of MRS. PIOZZI's account of DR. JOHNSON's opinion of the Jesuits, if he ever expressed any such opinion. It is somewhat strange, however, that in all BOSWELL's conversations with DR. JOHNSON, he should never have reported him as advancing any opinion in favor of the Jesuits; and it is certain that MRS. PIOZZI is not to be implicitly depended upon for correctness. BOSWELL convicts that sprightly Lady, upon the clearest evidence, of various inaccuracies in her narrative, which convey the most erroneous impressions of DR. JOHNSON's character and opinions. In one place he observes: "As a sincere friend "of the great man whose life I am writing, I think it neces-
"sary to guard my readers against the mistaken notion of
"DR. JOHNSON's character, which this Lady's Anecdotes of
"him convey."—See BOSWELL'S LIFE, Vol. iv. p. 357, Edit.
1799.

Again he observes: "I have had occasion several times
"in the course of this work, to point out the incorrectness of
"MRS. PIOZZI, as to particulars which fell within my own know-
"ledge." Ib. p. 358.—And again: "I certainly do not claim
"too much in behalf of my illustrious friend, in saying, that,
"however smart and entertaining her Anecdotes are, *they must*
"not be held as good evidence." Ib. 360. In the same page

BOSWELL, speaks of her “exaggeration and distortion;” and he adds, “It is with concern that I find myself obliged to ‘animadvert on the inaccuracies of MRS. PIOZZI’s Anecdotes, “and perhaps I may be thought to have dwelt too long upon “her little collection; but as, from JOHNSON’s long intimacy “with her, the account which she has given of him, may have “made an unfavorable and unjust impression, my duty as a “faithful biographer has obliged me reluctantly to perform “this unpleasing task.”

Let it however be admitted, for the sake of giving to the friends of the Jesuits all possible advantage from DR. JOHNSON’s opinion, that he really did, when in conversation with a French *Abbé* at Rouen, condemn the destruction of the Jesuits, as stated by MRS. PIOZZI, and what does this amount to? Simply, that a learned and excellent Protestant, who is known to have had a strong leaning towards some of the tenets of Popery, expressed an opinion, that this powerful Catholic Order was of advantage to the world, and that therefore it could not be advantageously suppressed. The History which follows may, perhaps, convince all who are open to conviction that DR. JOHNSON was completely mistaken, in the favorable opinion which he is supposed to have formed of this body of men; and that his notion of their being useful to the world, no more established than utility, than his opinion of the advantage of praying for the dead, established the fact that the dead are any better for our prayers. On one occasion DR. JOHNSON argued for THE INQUISITION; maintaining (says BOSWELL), that “false doctrine should be checked on its first appearance, that the civil power should unite with the Church, in punishing those who dared to attack the established religion, “and that such only were punished by the Inquisition.”—See BOSWELL’s Life, Vol. i. p. 421, Edit. 1799.—Now, although BOSWELL asserts, that this was not JOHNSON’s real opinion (in which perhaps he is correct), yet it at least shews, that the colloquial remarks of that great man cannot be always admitted, for the purpose of settling a disputed proposition. He

is well known to have often “talked” (as he himself termed it) “*for victory*,

“And e'en though vanquish'd he could argue still.”

We are then informed by MR. DALLAS, that DEAN KIRWAN, as well as VOLTAIRE, had his Education among the Jesuits; but, if one of these characters surmounted the errors of his education, and the other did not, this will not prove that the system of education pursued among the Jesuits is therefore a right one.

BAUSSET, a Catholic Bishop of our own times, is next cited (p. 145), to prove the excellence of the Jesuits; which is about as much to the purpose as if BISHOP MILNER were called to establish the same point.

To him succeed JUAN and ULLOA, the two Spanish Catholics, cited by PROFESSOR ROBERTSON.

In the shape that this Professor's statement from those writers appears in the beginning of MR. DALLAS's work, the Extract is all *in favor* of the Jesuits in PARAGUAY; and therefore MR. DALLAS, in afterwards adverting to JUAN and ULLOA as authorities in favor of the Jesuits, briefly observes that “their very names suggest the virtues and praises of the Jesuits,” and that he does “not think it necessary to extend their testimony.” They who have honoured this Answer with a perusal may remember that MR. DALLAS's partial and imperfect Extract from ROBERTSON respecting PARAGUAY, has been already exposed: the testimony of JUAN and ULLOA, from which ROBERTSON took his account, is by no means exclusively in favor of the Jesuits, as MR. DALLAS would have us believe. The fact is, that although those Catholic Historians intended to praise all they found, even they have said enough to let us see that all was not quite so praiseworthy as they wished us to think, while the weight of other testimony against the Jesuits in Paraguay is decisive on the subject.

RICHELIEU is MR. DALLAS's next authority (p. 147); but as every Protestant who might read MR. DALLAS's book,

might not recollect that this ambitious and imperious Minister was a Cardinal of the Romish Church, and might not know that he was devotedly attached to the Order of Jesuits, MR. DALLAS sinks both the one and the other of these facts, and leaves it to be inferred by those who choose to believe it, that he was altogether a disinterested witness.

The Cardinal is followed by *an Abbé* (p. 148), which is quite in orthodox order. This is no other than the Abbé RAYNAL, who is called by MR. DALLAS himself, “one of the ‘bitterest enemies of Christianity.’” Persons of MR. DALLAS’s sentiments may consider Political Cardinals and Infidel Abbés as very unexceptionable witnesses on behalf of their friends the Jesuits. If the British Public and its Parliament are satisfied with this kind of evidence, it will have been adduced to some purpose. But it happens farther, that the Abbé was a JESUIT himself. Perhaps they will like his testimony no less on that account! It certainly forms no objection with MR. DALLAS; he is much too liberal to think the worse of a man, or of his testimony, because he was a Jesuit *.

The next personages who appear in array as the Champions of the Jesuits, are THE BISHOPS OF FRANCE (p. 150).

The judgment of these right reverend Prelates has been considered by MR. DALLAS as of sufficient importance to print at length in his Appendix.

It will form no subject of astonishment, that THE BISHOPS OF FRANCE should have identified the existence of the Catholic Church with that of the Jesuits, when we recollect that even the Catholics of our own time, and our own country, are at this moment doing the same. It is a Clerical member of the Catholic Church, who has stood forward in defence of the Order, in the public newspapers; while both the Clerical and Lay members of that Church are pursuing the same pious work in the Popish Magazine, which ventures every month to

* A French Biographer remarks of RAYNAL’s *History of the Establishments and Commerce of the Europeans in both Indies*, that it ought to have been entitled, “The Voyages and History of Avarice.”

libel our Established Religion and constituted Authorities, and to abuse the patience* which has hitherto left such a work to the silent contempt which indeed appears to afford the best answer to it.

This judgment of the French Bishops was given as late as the reign of LOUIS XV. and indeed may be considered as the last great public act of the French Hierarchy: for, in little more than five-and-twenty years from its date, the Bishops of France were driven from their place in the nation, by the hurricane of the French Revolution. This act on the part of the Bishops was the result of the most notorious intrigues on the part of the Jesuits, and it was pronounced at a period when the corruption and wickedness of the National Church of France had nearly reached their height.

It was in consequence of the decisions of the Parliament against the Society in the year 1761, when their pernicious doctrines were publicly condemned, and their books committed to the flames, that the Jesuits exerted themselves to the utmost of their power, both at Rome and in France, for the purpose of preventing their inevitable ruin. They induced the Pope (CLEMENT XIII.), at the instance of their creature, CARDINAL TORREGIANI, who was paid for the purpose, to grant one Bull after another, in their favor, addressed to the French King, to the Bishops, and to the general body of the Clergy. The Jesuits were particularly assiduous with the Gallican Prelacy, as well as with the Papal Consistory, in the hope of averting their doom; and after having libelled the Parliament of Paris, for its bold and resolute conduct, they naturally turned to the Bishops of France, as their last resource.

The four questions which led to the judgment of the Bishops in their favor, upon which MR. DALLAS rests with so much confidence, were put at the suggestion of the Jesuits themselves, with a view to the Judgment which they antici-

* “Quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientiâ nostrâ?”—CICERO.

pated, and which has generally been ascribed to the pen of a Jesuit, of which indeed few who read it can entertain any doubt. In this Judgment the charges against the Jesuits of abusing the monstrous privileges which had been granted to them, are passed over in silence; as are the errors of their Constitutions, their infamous morality, and their regicide doctrines, with the exception only (as to the last) of an endeavour to exculpate them from the charge of employing RAVAILLAC to assassinate HENRY IV. (which is slurred over in MR. DALLAS's translation), but without disproving their part in the attempts of BARRIERE and CHATEL on the life of the same Monarch. To the Judgment of these forty-five Bishops, may be opposed the Judgment of the several Bishops of France, ever since the Jesuits had an origin, as enumerated in the following History.

In March, 1762, appeared the Decree of LOUIS XV. which had for its object the regulation and reform of the Society, and its restraint within certain limits. A measure so feeble appeared at once to the Parliament as worse than useless; and they presented to the King a collection of THE ASSERTIONS of the Jesuits themselves, extracted from their avowed writings, in order to shew the impossibility of reforming a Society, whose principles were so radically vicious as to endure and encourage doctrines opposed to the main articles of Religion. On the other hand, useless and hopeless as this Reform would have been, the General of Jesuits (LAURENCE RICCI), and the impotent CLEMENT XIII. who was governed by their creature TORREGIANI, absolutely refused to lend themselves to any reform, notwithstanding the wishes of the King of France on that point. — “ Let them continue as they are” (said they), “ or continue no longer—*sint ut sunt, aut non sint.*”—This was all the answer which LOUIS XV. could obtain; which obliged him, however reluctantly, to declare in the end against their continuance at all.

To return to THE JUDGMENT OF THE BISHOPS. It was impossible that such a document should deceive the King, or

wash away the stains which rested upon the Jesuits. How was it possible, for instance, for any man who was acquainted with the History of France, to believe the assertion of the Bishops, that “ the Jesuits professed no other obedience to “ their General, than was consistent with their duty towards “ their King and Country ? ” As well might the same thing have been pretended of the Papists in England, formerly, and in Ireland at this moment ! Accordingly the King knew better than to be thus imposed upon.

On the 6th August, 1762, the Parliament unanimously resolved on a Decree against the Jesuits, of the most masterly description, which concludes by abolishing the Order. This argumentative and able document is supported by incontestable proofs, and it is only to be regretted that its length should preclude its publication as a proper antidote to **THE JUDGMENT OF THE BISHOPS**, which had just appeared before it*. It was a matter of duty in MR. DALLAS, from which no considerations can discharge him, to have noticed (however briefly) the complete and triumphant answer which was given by this powerful and conclusive piece of reasoning to his vaunted Judgment of the French Bishops. It was not to be expected, indeed, nor is it required of MR. DALLAS, that he should either have admired or applauded that Reply. He has formed his opinion ; and even such a Reply as that of the Parliament, was not likely to have altered it ; but it was at least due to the public, that he should not have passed over, in contemptuous silence, as solemn and judicial an act on the part of the Parliament, as that which he has thought fit to record on the part of the Bishops, and an act which followed the Judgment of the Bishops, within a few months of its promulgation.

Let us now look a little at the secret history of the conduct of the Bishops of France, on this memorable occasion, and we shall perhaps discover some of the springs and pulleys which set the machine of Episcopacy in motion.

The Archbishop of Paris (BEAUMONT) was, at the period in question, decidedly attached to the Jesuits: he was a man eminently unqualified for his high station, it having been notorious that he had only taken the degree of Doctor by mere favor; his profound ignorance and excessive vanity induced him to neglect his Diocese, and occupy himself in the concerns of the Jesuits. He seconded the Pope in the most vigorous manner, making obedience to the Bulls in favor of the Jesuits, a test of orthodoxy throughout his Diocese: he multiplied interdicts, expelled from Livings, and exercised many other arbitrary acts of Episcopal authority, with a view to the exclusive interests of the Order of Jesuits; and so manifest was his partiality and injustice, that his Pastoral Charge in favor of the Jesuits was burnt by the Parliament; and he was publicly denounced by the Magistrates of the realm as a factious disturber of the peace of his own Church and Diocese, who had, for fifteen years, only excited agitation where he should have promoted union *.

Another Prelate who was at this time devotedly attached to the Jesuits, and who chiefly assisted in influencing the rest in declaring for them, was M. DE LA ROCHE-AIMON, who was President of the Assembly of the Clergy at this period.— He was a Prelate in the highest favor at Court, having the disposal of the principal Church-preferments, in distributing which he had by no means forgotten himself: he was, in the first place, Bishop of Sarepta abroad; while, at home, he was Bishop of Tarbes, Archbishop of Thoulouse, Archbishop of Narbonne, and lastly Archbishop of Rheims, Grand Almoner of France, and a Cardinal! He was one of the greatest friends and patrons of the Jesuits; and it was not less owing to him than to the Archbishop of Paris, that the Jesuits were enabled to influence the Bishops and Clergy in their favor.

The third Ecclesiastic who had a chief share in producing the same result, was the well-known LOMENIE DE BRIENNE,

* See *Remontrances du Parlement*, p. 6 et seq.

a man whose immoralities were a scandal to the French Episcopacy in the reign of LOUIS XV. He was an Archbishop, a Cardinal, and a Prime Minister. He presided over a Committee whose main object was the influencing of the Clergy of France, especially the Superiors of that Body, in the protection and support of the Jesuits. He was the intimate friend of D'ALEMBERT, and was generally thought to have had him for an adviser; a trait (by the way) which, if it be correct, may serve to shew that D'ALEMBERT himself favored the Jesuits, contrary to the assertion of MR. DALLAS, who, in the early part of his work, seeks to establish his opposition to the Order of Jesuits. However this may have been, it is certain that BRIENNE himself espoused the cause of the Jesuits with the greatest ardour. In the prosecution of that object, he influenced several of his Brethren on the Bench, and many of the inferior Clergy, in their favor; and, by this means, assisted in widening the breach between the Church and the Parliament, and in aggravating a dispute, which though not one of the primary, was one of the secondary causes of the French Revolution. The Bishops, as a body, although by no means sunk so low as their leaders, were yet, as a general question, in a state of secularity and corruption, which partook of any thing but the piety and zeal of vital Christianity. Their condition was at the same time truly deplorable; for, on the one hand, they were compelled to witness the powerful attack which was now in full operation on the part of the various Infidels and Philosophers, who were assailing Religion in general, through the sides of Popery and its vices; while, on the other hand, they were urged by the Pope and the Jesuits to a vigorous declaration in favor of the Order, although they had themselves well nigh lost the confidence of the nation at large.

In this critical state of things, the Jesuits succeeded, by their intrigues, in inducing the Bishops to believe that they could not better promote their own interests than in declaring for them. Instead, therefore, of making common cause with that portion of the Church and Nation, in which some remains

of real piety and good sense were yet to be found, they openly espoused the cause of the Jesuits, revived the ancient opposition to Jansenism, and resolved to make the acceptance of the famous Bull *Unigenitus*, a touchstone of true faith, in all who were admitted to the priestly office, and even in Laymen, over whom they possessed any influence. In this object they became more completely and interminably embroiled with the Parliament.

The final Edict of Louis XV. against the Order, which took place in November, 1764, sufficiently proves how little effect the arguments of the Bishops, in their boasted Judgment of 1762, had produced upon the Royal mind: the Church of France, having thus lost the confidence and countenance of its King and its Parliament, proceeded, in despair, through the influence of the Bishops who have been named, to a General Assembly of the Clergy, which was holden in the year 1765; after which they experienced the mortification of having their official acts in that Assembly condemned and annulled by the Parliament.

The brief history, therefore, of the Bishops and Clergy of France at this period of their open licentiousness, and concealed Atheism, is simply this, that having long lost the confidence of the nation by their private and personal conduct, they now lost the confidence of the King and the Parliament, by a blind obedience to the Pope, and an infatuated attachment to the Jesuits; their protection and support of whom against the united voice of all the authority and virtue left in the nation, at once sealed their own destruction, and precipitated the overthrow of the national Church, over which they so unworthily presided*.

MR. DALLAS, therefore, will not find THE JUDGMENT OF THE BISHOPS OF FRANCE, in this last and most degraded pe-

* The above facts are principally drawn from the work, entitled, "Les Jesuites tels qu'ils ont été dans l'*Ordre politique, religieux, et morale*," which MR. DALLAS pleasantly imagines (see p. 95 of his work) he has *answered without having seen*!

riod of their history, entitled to all the credit and consequence which he is desirous to attach to it, especially when the intrigues which produced it, and the consequences to which it led, are considered; and had he really desired to consult the interests of the Jesuits, as well as the character of the Modern Roman Catholic Prelacy, he would not have selected with so much care, or produced with so much pomp, a document which the more prudent friends of the Jesuits and of Popery would rather wish to have seen for ever buried in oblivion.

In concluding the observations upon MR. DALLAS's authorities in favor of the Jesuits, it may be right to observe, that most of such authorities (particularly those of MONTESQUIEU, HALLER, RICHELIEU, BUFFON, and MURATORI, as also his Defence of the Jesuit LAVALETTE, which will be noticed hereafter) and all that he has said respecting the excellence of the Institute, the advantages of the Missions, and the discipline of the Schools, may be found in the Apology for the Jesuits, which was avowedly the work of one of their own Order! See *Apologia pro Instituto Societatis Jesu cum Licentiâ Superiorum; Editio Augustae Vindelicorum, 1765*—and also the Edition of the same work in the French language.

Perhaps, as “great wits jump,” MR. DALLAS may wish to have it thought, that, in conducting his Defence of the Jesuits, he discovered the same authorities, and stated the same arguments, as the Jesuit who defended them before, without his having been indebted to so able a prompter.

This, however, is a matter of little consequence to the main argument; since, as MR. DALLAS has thought it worth his while to come forward on this occasion, it appeared necessary to the cause of truth, that he should not be left in undisputed possession of the field, whether his authorities and arguments were his own, or those of other men.

MR. DALLAS then professes (p. 153) to consider the objections arising from the *Ambition*, the *Commerce*, and the *Sedition* of the Jesuits.

As to their *Ambition*, he denies that they “have shaped

“ their course to the richest and most commodious countries, “ or raised on the Cross a throne to their ambition, rather than “ to Christ;” and he asserts, that, “ on the contrary, the “ Jesuits renounced all ecclesiastical honours by a formal “ vow, and were prohibited all political employments, by the “ most rigorous penalties of their own Institute;” that “ the “ countries where we hear of Jesuits, are inhabited by Can- “ nibals, by Hurons, Iroquois, Canadians, Illinoise, Negroes, “ Ethiopians, Laplanders, and Tartars; they are” (says he) “ barren deserts, eternal snows, burning sands, gloomy forests: “ there did these *ambitious* men live on wild herbs, and bitter “ roots, and cover themselves with leaves or the skins of wild “ beasts.”

The more complete proof that the very essence of the Jesuits’ system was an ambition which knew no bounds, must be reserved for the following History, as must the proof that they enjoyed as much of the good things of this life as any of the most favored of the species. They were, indeed, neither aseetics nor hermits, and both these facts will appear satisfactorily hereafter; at present the following remarks shall suffice.

The University of France shews, in its second Apology in 1643, that they abandoned those regions where there was nothing to gain, for such as were favorable to commerce *.

The Jesuits themselves, in their Address to the King in 1594, said, “ We have Colleges” (Colleges, MR. DALLAS, not Hermitages) “ in Japan towards the East; in Brazil towards “ the West; in Lima and the farthest part of Peru, and in “ the extremity of the western Regions; in Mexico, which lies “ between them towards the North; in Goa, a town and coun- “ try forming two thirds of the distance between Lisbon and “ Japan, a journey of 6000 leagues: we have Colleges in “ many parts of the East and West Indies; and where we “ have no regular Colleges, our members are to be found in “ the regions of Mount Libanus and Egypt, of Africa and “ China †.”

* See *Seconde Apologie de l’Université*, 1643, 3d part, p. 3.

† See *Très humble Rémonstrance et Requête au Roi*.

THE BISHOP OF HELIOPOLIS, in his Memoir for the College *de Propaganda Fide* in 1677, says of their constant persecution of all other Priests and Missionaries (the proofs of which will appear hereafter), “Wherever they may be, they will add “mit neither of Superiors nor Equals.” And THE BISHOP OF ANGELOPOLIS says, in his Letter to POPE INNOCENT X. dated 8th of January, 1649, “Their power is at this time so formidable in the whole Church, their riches are so great, their credit so extraordinary, and the deference which is paid them is so absolute, that they erect themselves above all “Dignities, Laws, Councils, and Constitutions.”

With regard to their *Commerce*. Their usurious practices in CHINA, and their immense gains arising from their Commerce there and elsewhere, will also appear in the following History: without a Commerce conducted on the largest scale and with the greatest spirit, they could not have carried their ambition so far as to support a powerful army, and resist the two Kingdoms of Spain and Portugal; nor could they have bribed the Papal Consistory, acquired friends, and appeased enemies, nor, in the language of HENRY IV. have “maintained intelligence and correspondence all over the world.”

It is impossible that the proofs upon this subject should appear in the Reply to MR. DALLAS, as they do throughout the following History; but a little may be said upon it here.

MR. DALLAS first observes that Commerce “is forbidden “by the Canons of the Church to Ecclesiastics;” as if the Jesuits were likely to trouble themselves with the anti-commercial prohibitions of the Church. The Jesuits, however, he says, “had a Depot at Lisbon, where they kept effects “which served them instead of money; these things were sold “to support the brothers of the Order in America, who *having no income* could only be supplied with commodities in “those savage countries.” After this unintelligible statement of the nature and uses of the Lisbon Depot, he quotes the Spanish Catholics JUAN and ULLOA, to prove the pious kind of barter which obtained between the Jesuits and the Indians,

and to shew with what sanctity and simplicity the Jesuits carried on trade in that quarter. He then passes à *toute bride* over the scandalous bankruptcy of the Jesuit LAVALETTE, and his Mercantile Colleagues, which produced a considerable sensation throughout Europe, and observes, that “ the circumstances attending his conduct are not *very clear* :” he then inquires, “ what numerous body can be answerable for every individual of it ;” after which, he contrives to extract from the whole affair of LAVALETTE’s Bankruptcy (the circumstances of which shall be noticed shortly) the extraordinary and unwarrantable conclusion, that “ it exonerates all other Jesuit Missionaries from the charge of trading !”

The widely extended Commerce of the Jesuits has been, from their earliest history, the inexhaustible source of their wealth. They obtained from POPE GREGORY XIII. under the plea of POVERTY, which has always been so useful to them, the privilege of trading in the most remote countries. It was he, who, in permitting them to go to Japan, ostensibly as Missionaries, virtually licensed them as Merchants; and although other Popes withdrew these privileges, the Jesuits were not much embarrassed by their prohibitions, proceeding to persecute and expel the Missionaries of all other Religious Orders, on every occasion where they were in their way *.

THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS, in 1644, reproached them with “ the insatiable avarice which had crept into their ostentatious piety, and which made them traverse the most distant seas to seek any thing else than souls, as had been proved by the most authentic documents †.”

THE BISHOP OF HELIOPOLIS, in his Memoirs for the College *de propaganda fide*, in 1677, refers the Jesuits’ persecution of all other Missionaries to “ their desire of concealing from Europe what they were doing in those nations, particularly the Commerce which they had always carried on, and were

* See *La Morale pratique, Mémoires des Missions Etrangères, and du Père Norbert*; also the *Letters of M. Favre*.

† See *Réponse à l’Apologie du Père Caussin*, ch. xxvii.

“ resolved to continue, notwithstanding the prohibitions of the
“ Popes.”

M. MARTIN, Governor of Pondicherry, observes, “ It is
“ certain that, next to the Dutch, the Jesuits carry on the
“ greatest and most productive commerce with India. Their
“ trade surpasses even that of the English, as well as that of
“ the Portuguese, who established them in India. There may
“ possibly, indeed, be some Jesuits who go there from reli-
“ gious motives; but they are very few, and it is not such as
“ those, who know the grand secret of the Company. Some
“ among them are Jesuits secularized, who do not appear to
“ be such, because they never wear the habit; which is the
“ reason why at Surat, Agra, Goa, and every where else they
“ are taken for real Merchants of the countries whose names
“ they bear. For it is certain that there are some of all na-
“ tions, even of Armenia and Turkey, and of every other
“ which can be useful and necessary to the Society. These
“ disguised Jesuits are intriguing every where. The secret
“ intercourse which is preserved among them, instructs them
“ mutually in the merchandise which they ought to buy or
“ sell, and with what nation they can most advantageously
“ trade: so that these masked Jesuits make an immense profit
“ for the Society, to which alone they are responsible, through
“ the medium of those Jesuits who traverse the world in the
“ habit of St. Ignatius, and who enjoy the confidence, know
“ the secrets, and act under the orders of the heads of Eu-
“ rope.” Again: “ These Jesuits, disguised and dispersed
“ over the whole earth, and who all know each other by signs,
“ like the Free Masons, invariably act upon one system *.
“ They send merchandise to other disguised Jesuits, who
“ having it thus at first hand, make a considerable profit of

* DECEPTION, under one form or other, is the unvarying policy of the Jesuits, who can, with equal ease, pretend to be what they are not, and dissemble what they are; answering precisely to the description given by SALLUST of a well-known character, “ CUJUSLIBET RE-
“ SIMULATOR ET DISSIMULATOR.”

“ it, for the Society. This traffic, however, is very injurious
 “ to France. I have often written respecting it to the East
 “ India Company trading here; but I have received express
 “ and repeated orders from it” (under LOUIS XIV.) “ to
 “ concede and advance to these Fathers, whatever they might
 “ require of me. The Jesuit TACHARD, alone, owes that Com-
 “ pany, at this moment, above four hundred and fifty thousand
 “ Livres. Those Jesuits who, like TACHARD, pass and re-
 “ pass between this quarter and Europe, are ambulatory Di-
 “ rectors and Receivers General of the Bank, and of the
 “ Trade *.”

“ In the Antilles” (says COUDRETTE) “ LAVALETTE the
 “ Jesuit has half the worth of the property, for whose con-
 “ veyance to France he undertakes. In Portugal the Jesuits
 “ had vessels employed exclusively in their service; which
 “ facts are established by the process of Cardinal Saldanha.
 “ All the accounts of Travellers in the East Indies speak in
 “ the same way, with astonishment, of the extent of their
 “ commerce. In Europe, and even in France, they have
 “ Banks in the most commercial Cities, such as Marseilles,
 “ Paris, Genoa, and Rome: in addition to this, they publicly
 “ sell drugs in their houses; and in order to their sanction in
 “ this, they procured from POPE GREGORY XIII. the privi-
 “ lege of exercising the art of medicine. Their medical La-
 “ boratory at Lyons is celebrated. That of Paris, which was
 “ sufficiently well known before, became still more so, on the
 “ seizure which the apothecaries made of their compounds.
 “ Even at Rome, in spite of the opposition of the tradesmen,
 “ and the prohibitions of the Pope, they carry on trade in
 “ Baking, Grocery, &c. Let us only imagine Twenty Thou-
 “ sand Traders, dispersed over the world from Japan to
 “ Brazil, from the Cape of Good Hope to the North, all cor-
 “ respondents of each other, all blindly subjected to one Indi-
 “ vidual, and working for him alone; conducting two hundred
 “ Missions, which are so many Factories; six hundred and

* See *Voyage de Duquesne, Chef d'Escadre*, Vol. iii. p. 15 et seq.

“ twelve Colleges; and four hundred and twenty-three houses
 “ of Professors, Noviciates, and Residents, which are so many
 “ *Entrepôts*; and then let us form an idea, if we can, of the
 “ produce of a commerce of so vast an extent *.”

Let us lastly hear THE BISHOP OF ANGELOPOLIS, who in his Letter to POPE INNOCENT X. has the following passage:

“ What other Order (most Holy Father) from the first
 “ origin of Monks and Mendicants, or any other of the Religious,
 “ has made a Bank of the Church of God, has lent
 “ money at interest, and publicly conducted butcheries and
 “ other shops in its houses; a traffic which is disgraceful, and
 “ unworthy of Religious characters? What other Order has
 “ ever become Bankrupt, or, to the great surprise and scandal
 “ of the Laity, has filled almost all the world by sea and land
 “ with its trade, and its commercial contracts? Undoubtedly
 “ such profane and worldly conduct does not appear to have
 “ been dictated by Him, who declares in his Gospel, that no
 “ one can serve God and Mammon.

“ All the great and populous City of Seville is in tears:
 “ the widows of that country, pupils, orphans, virgins, Priests,
 “ and Laymen, mingle their lamentations on account of their
 “ having been miserably deceived by the Jesuits, who, after
 “ having obtained from them above 400,000 Ducats, and
 “ spent them all for their own purposes, only paid them by a
 “ disgraceful bankruptcy; but having been brought to justice,
 “ and convicted to the great scandal of all Spain, of acts which,
 “ in private Individuals, would have been capital offences, they
 “ made every effort to withdraw themselves from the secular
 “ jurisdiction, by their claims of spiritual immunity, and
 “ named Ecclesiastics for their Judges, until the matter having
 “ at length been carried before the Royal Council of Castille, it
 “ decreed, that, since the Jesuits exercised the same Commerce
 “ as was practised by Laymen, they ought to be treated like
 “ Laymen, and sent back to the secular power. Thus a great
 “ multitude of persons who are reduced to ask charity, demand

* See COUDRETTÉ'S HISTORY, Vol. iv. p. 201.

“ at this hour with tears from the civil Tribunals, the money
 “ which they have lent to the Jesuits; which to some was all
 “ their substance, to others all their dowry, to others all their
 “ savings and subsistence, who in consequence exclaim loudly
 “ against the perfidy of these Religious, and load them with
 “ execration *.

“ What will English and German Protestants say of these
 “ things, who boast of preserving such inviolable fidelity in
 “ their engagements, and of proceeding in their commerce
 “ with so much sincerity and frankness? They must cer-
 “ tainly make a mock at the Roman Catholic faith, at ecclesi-
 “ astical discipline, at Priests, Regulars, and the holiest profes-
 “ sions in the Church, and become only more hardened and
 “ obdurate in their errors.

“ Have such proceedings as these, which are absolutely
 “ worldly and unlawful, ever been practised by any other
 “ Religious Order, than by the most holy Society of Jesu-
 “ its? Has any example of such conduct been ever witness-
 “ ed in any other Society of Priests, who, by devoting them-
 “ selves to the service of God, have at the same time stood
 “ pledged to the contempt of temporal things †?”

With regard to the third charge against the Jesuits, namely, that of *Sedition*, MR. DALLAS finds it convenient to consider only their Sedition in PARAGUAY, which, however, was rather an act of open rebellion against the Parent States of Spain and Portugal. MR. DALLAS hurries over the charge of Sedition, as affecting the Jesuits in other countries, as if he were passing over burning lava; but he dwells with complacency on the

* The Jesuit LAVALETTE was at the head of the Mission to Martinique, and the greatest Merchant of the West India Islands. The sum for which he failed, was no less than three millions of money. Many persons who were interested, applied to the Parliament of Paris, who ascertained on that as on other occasions, that the General of the Order, who resided at Rome, possessed complete control over the property of the Society.

† See Letter of PALAFOX, BISHOP OF ANGELOPOLIS, to POPE INNOCENT X. dated 8th of January, 1649, p. 39, Edit. Cologne, 1666.

paradise of PARAGUAY, which it was at one time so fashionable among French philosophers and novelists to extol as a kind of fairy-land, where milk and honey flowed again, and where men were wise without the trouble of learning, and good without the fear of punishment. MR. DALLAS has recourse, in proof of these points, to the same Spanish Historians as he had quoted before; and he finds, from their testimony, that the only reasons why the Jesuits did not permit an intercourse between the amiable savages, who were under their care, and the corrupt Europeans who went to India, was from a fear lest the primitive innocence and Arcadian simplicity of their converts, should be injured by the contamination of evil example. All this is certainly very sentimental: let us now see how the fact really stood in PARAGUAY.

The Manifestoes of THE KING OF PORTUGAL, and the Bull of POPE BENEDICT XIV. issued in 1740, on the rebellious conduct of the Jesuits in PARAGUAY, will sufficiently shew what sort of Masters these poor savages had to deal with. It appears uncontestedly from those documents, that the Jesuits reduced the Indians both of PARAGUAY and URGUAY to the most odious state of slavery; and that, under pretence of making the native Indians imitate the primitive Church of Jerusalem in its vow of poverty, they enriched themselves by the incessant labours of from five to six hundred thousand of these religious slaves.

With respect to the actual usurpation by the Jesuits of the Sovereignty of PARAGUAY, there is no fact of history better established, not only by many authentic statements, but by the above-mentioned Manifesto of the King of Portugal, and his various public proclamations and decrees. It appears from these, that, from the beginning of the seventeenth century, they had laid the foundation of the powerful monarchy, which they designed to establish there; that, in the middle of the following century, they had levied troops and organized armies, which openly opposed those of the Spanish and Portuguese Crowns; that, as soon as they found that measures of

hostility were taken against them, they excited sedition in the interior of the kingdom of Portugal, at Oporto, and elsewhere, for the purpose of maintaining their usurpation—that they finally fomented and directed by their counsels, the attempt upon the person of the King of Portugal (which will be more fully noticed hereafter), and that their General had himself in a Memorial, which he presented to the Pope, actually threatened these disorders. Nor are the charges against the Jesuits for insurrection and rebellion, confined to PARAGUAY. From the Documents and Decrees in question, it appears that wherever the King of Portugal had possessions in the four quarters of the world, their crimes were manifest; at length their Schools were suppressed, and they were driven from all the States of that Empire.

What shall we now think of MR. DALLAS's assertion (p. 113), that “it has been proved that the religious doctrines of “the Jesuits never led them as a body to interfere in political “affairs?”

Thus much for the three charges of *Ambition*, *Commerce*, and *Sedition*, and for the manner in which MR. DALLAS has attempted to shew, that, upon these, as upon other articles objected to them, the Jesuits are little less than immaculate. So completely indeed is he warmed by the subject of their virtues, and so indignant does he feel at the imputations which have been cast upon them, that, in concluding their defence upon these three heads of accusation, he declares that the Jesuits “appear to him to have been actuated by the sublimest motives, “such as might be attributed to ANGELS; the glory of God, and “the benefit of mankind !!!”

This elevated flight is followed (p. 167) by a piteous story, of one of the revolutionary massacres which took place at Avignon; the recital of which is given with much pomp of circumstance, but with no other object than to introduce to our notice a M. NOLHAC, who happened to be the Confessor of many unfortunate victims, who on this occasion were his fellow-sufferers. If, indeed, M. NOLHAC had only been a simple Priest,

we should have heard nothing either of him or his unhappy companions ; but it happens that “ M. NOLHAC was A JESUIT.” This is quite enough for the lively vigilance of MR. DALLAS, ever intent upon levying contributions upon the slightest fact which appears likely, by any latitude of construction, to avail him in his Defence of the Jesuits. Because this man was A JESUIT he was “ a martyr;” although religion was no part of the pretext for a massacre, in which he was sacrificed, with not fewer than six hundred other Catholics, no one of whom, however, is honoured with the same title. Because he was A JESUIT, we are expected to believe he was so exemplary, as he is stated to have been, in all the duties of self-denial, pastoral vigilance, and purity of life. Because he was A JESUIT, we are led to infer that the consolations which he is represented as having administered at last to the Prisoners who suffered with him, were of the most superior and encouraging nature * ; in short, the whole object of the story is avowedly to convey an impression, that if the Jesuits at large had been the characters they are represented, there never would have been such a Jesuit as this: as if it had ever been asserted to be a necessary consequence of joining the Order of Jesuits, that no single individual could by any possibility escape all the crimes which characterized the Body at large.

MR. DALLAS’s Chapter on the principal features of the INSTITUTE OF THE JESUITS, succeeds to the account of the Jesuit M. NOLHAC. After much of general assertion respecting the unmerited slanders, which he conceives the Jesuits to

* With regard to the nature of the consolation thus administered to six hundred persons; Protestants will do well to consider the following passage in MR. DALLAS’s work:—“ Already had that unspeakable pleasure, that peace which only God can give, *as in Heaven he ratifies the Absolution of his Minister on Earth*, taken place of fear on their countenances, when the voices of the banditti were heard calling out ‘ their victims,’ &c. It is not quite so clear to other Protestants as it is to MR. DALLAS, that a Priest’s absolution of six hundred persons is ratified in Heaven !

have experienced, and respecting those unprovoked enemies, who (as he appears to suppose), from the mere pleasure of opposing so much excellence, have, in all ages and countries, declared against them; MR. DALLAS proceeds to give some account of THE INSTITUTE OF THE JESUITS, and of its professed object, namely, "*the promotion of the greater glory of God.*"

There is nothing too bad to be defended, if he who undertakes its defence, is but acquainted with his business. Let there be only some favourable circumstances connected with any (no matter what) mass of moral or physical evil, a skilful advocate will never fail to seize the advantageous part of the case, and convert it to his own purpose; while he will either slightly censure, or skilfully palliate, all which makes against him, even though the bulk of mankind should, by common consent, have agreed to execrate and condemn it. It was upon this principle, that a certain Orator mentioned by MILTON was able to "make the worse appear the better reason;" and such kind of logic is often urged with success, in a world which was truly described by one who knew it, in those well-known lines :

" The world is naturally averse
 " To all the good it sees or hears ;
 " But swallows nonsense and a lie
 " With greediness and gluttony." **HUDIBRAS.**

MR. DALLAS is not singular in opposing an Institute professing morality, to the immoral practices of its disciples. Thus, when it was a question whether Christianity should be diffused in India on an extended scale, many persons became advocates for the purity of the Institutes of MENU; proclaimed the praises of Hindoo morality; and opposed the Shasters of the East, to the Scriptures of God himself: in other words, they had the audacity to defend Idolatry in a country, whose public profession, safeguard, and glory, was the Religion of the Bible.

When the advocates for the civilization and freedom of

Africa declared the Slave-trade to be an ignominious and impolitic commerce, there were not wanting, even in England, many persons, both in and out of Parliament, who for a series of years defended that infamous traffic—contended that Negroes were incapable of freedom, and contented with their chains—and asserted that their own national religion was too pure and perfect to require another: in other words, these men for a course of years defended slavery and rapine, crime and bloodshed, in the face of a nation which appeared to exist, only to communicate blessings wherever she was known.

The world is now called upon to admire THE INSTITUTE OF THE JESUITS, and hence to conclude that if so many beauties appear in the theory of Jesuitism, its practice must be equally worthy of admiration. It will be abundantly proved in the following History, that the Institute, Constitutions, and Rules of the Society, are themselves among the chief causes of the practical corruption of the Order; and virtually prescribe a line of conduct, which is at variance with the most obvious rules of Scripture and right reason.

That any very flagrant recommendations of vice should appear in a Code intended for the public eye, is not meant to be asserted; nor has it been denied that it contains many excellent passages. The slightest acquaintance with human nature must convince us, that no Code which professes to lay down rules of action for rational creatures could appear before them divested of all high-sounding sentiments; the feelings of mankind exact this homage to virtue, and the policy of the Lawgiver falls in with the requisition: we find, accordingly, that no Code has failed to recognise and assert some great standard principles of morality. This was the case even before the Gospel dispensation, and it is equally so at present. The remark applies alike to CONFUCIUS and ZOROASTER, to MAHOMET and to BUONAPARTE. None of those systems which have been most successful in corrupting and misleading the world, have formally set out by enouncing immoral maxims, or by exhorting to the practice of crimes; since, if they had

done so, the world, greedy as it is of novelty, and fond as it is of error, would have been disgusted at the outset. A certain portion of sound doctrine has always been introduced into the worst Creeds and Codes: but it has been only given in such manner and quantity as to promote the delusion; since, in order to convey error with any prospect of success, there must necessarily be such a mixture of truth, as may render it palatable. Pure unmixed error is too gross to obtain currency; in order to pass, it must be always sheltered under the cover of some admitted truths. If, however, in the following History, a necessary connexion can be proved to exist between the practices and the laws of the Jesuits; if it can be shewn that those laws involve a course of action, alike dishonourable to God, and detrimental to his creatures, what will then become of the few lofty and glittering common places with which, under the semblance of promoting "THE GREATER GLORY OF GOD," IGNATIUS has contrived to interlard his Code?

It is true, indeed, that MR. DALLAS attaches considerable importance to the Jesuitical phrase of "*the greater glory of God*"—(see pages 179, 180, 181 and 182); but does he require to be informed, that although, upon scriptural and sober principles, no higher rule of action can be proposed, yet that this phrase, or any other, may be employed by the worst men, and for the worst purposes? nay, that, in every age of the world, bad men have been able to effect more mischief, and propagate more error, by fair professions and fine phrases, than they could ever have brought about without them?

"The Devil can quote Scripture for his purpose."—SHAKSPEARE.

It is shewn in the Historical account of the steps taken by the Jesuits to obtain possession of the Abbeys, which FERDINAND II. had taken in Germany, that it was under this very pretext of "THE GREATER GLORY OF GOD" that the Jesuits acted on that occasion *.

* See "Histoire mémorable du Procédé qu'ont tenu les Jesuites, pour

The claims of such a plea as "*the greater glory of God*," to public admiration, must depend upon many other circumstances than the mere enunciation of such an object. It is not enough for us to know that a specious phrase is used; we must know who are the characters that employ it, and what they mean by it when it is used. If we find, upon inquiry, that, when the Jesuits speak of "*the greater glory of God*," they consider that the enrichment of their own Order, the increase of their own religion, and the extension of their own influence, are among the means of advancing that "*greater glory*;" if we find, that, in order to the same end, they conceive that casuistry and crime, the propagation of falsehood, and the persecution of Protestants, are necessary auxiliaries; if we find them sometimes regarding the doctrine of Regicide as a means of promoting "*the greater glory of God*," and, at other times, asserting the lawfulness of rebellion and sedition, in order to the same great end—we must pause before we concur in MR. DALLAS's proposition, that the bare profession of advancing "*the greater glory of God*" supplies any proof that it will be so advanced. Does MR. DALLAS imagine, that in this period of the world's age, men are to be "*ravished with the whistling of a name*;" or that, after having indulged him, by rejecting all Historical evidence, they will rest satisfied with the substitution, in its stead, of a flourish of rhetoric, or an imposing period?

There can be no doubt that the contrivers of some of the foulest tragedies which have disgraced the Romish Church (such, for instance, as the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, in Paris; for which notable triumph over Heretics, the Pope of that day returned public thanks to God,—or the intended explosion of the fifth of November, in England), really thought that "*the greater glory of God*" would be promoted by such measures.

"*enlever aux Religieux de Saint Benoit, de St. Augustin, des Gisteaux et des Premontrés, les Abbayes que l'Empereur Ferdinand II. avoit retirées des Mains des Protestants d'Allemagne*,"—vers la fin.

When St. Paul, that bitter persecutor of the Church of Christ (in his unconverted state), "breathed" only "threatenings and slaughter against the people of God—made havock of the Church—entered into every house, committed both men and women to prison—compelled them to blaspheme, "and was exceedingly mad against them," he himself assures us, that he "verily thought he *ought* to do such things;" that is, in the phrase of Jesuitism, he thought he was promoting "the greater glory of God:" but does his own opinion prove that he was doing any such thing? does not he himself afterwards admit, and do we not all know, that, in the destruction of others, so far from advancing the glory of God, he was doing the work of him who was, as our Lord determines, "a murderer from the beginning?"

Thus again our Lord himself declares of the early Christians, that "whosoever killed them, would think he did God service;" but MR. DALLAS surely does not mean to contend that this circumstance affords any plea for the persecutions of Paganism.

Let it be conceded to the Jesuits and other Catholics, that, in persecuting Protestants, they have believed they were doing God service; what does this amount to? Not that they are really promoting "the greater glory of God," or that such a system ought to be tolerated, because any set of men have a fine phrase to defend it by*. A learned Frenchman has observed, that "there are persons in the world, who would wish "that one half of mankind should murder the other half *for the glory of God.*"

Let a man open the pages of D'AVILA, and read the account given by that Historian (although a Catholic) of THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW in Paris; and he will see that the glory of God was the ostensible motive of the miscreants who

* The remark of an old writer, on such a plea as this, is worthy of being preserved—"Non hoc profecto ad majorem Dei, imò nec ad "majorem *SOCIETATIS*, gloriam."

engaged in that awful destruction of those very Protestants, whom they had first lulled into security by the most treacherous promises of peace and friendship. Let him turn to the History of THE SICILIAN VESPERS, and he will find the same avowed object resorted to, in order to sanction a tragedy as horrid in itself, though not acted upon so large a scale, as the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Let him turn to the horrors which followed THE REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTZ, by that ambitious and bigoted friend of the Jesuits, LOUIS XIV.; to the persecutions of the Albigenses and the Waldenses; to the cruelties in the Low Countries; to the general massacre in Ireland; or to the martyrdoms in England; and he will find Catholics in power, invariably persecutors of Protestants, and as invariably sheltering themselves under the pretext of promoting by the unhallowed means of murder, confiscation, and pillage, “the greater glory of God.” It is an integral part of their system, as well as that of the Jesuits (though not perhaps so openly avowed), that it is lawful to “do evil that good may come;” a principle which would manifestly sanction and justify all the evil that has ever been committed in the world, and even render its perpetrators objects of applause, rather than of censure. Being themselves judges of the *evil* to be committed, it was inevitable that they should think little of its atrocity; and being themselves also judges of the *good* to be achieved, it was equally natural that they should mistake its quality, and magnify its amount. “Calling good evil, and evil good,” what was to be expected from such judges, and from such executioners of their own decrees? And yet these are the men to whom we are now to confide our interests, and those of our Children, with the most unsuspecting confidence, because, forsooth, they had ever in view “THE GREATER GLORY “ OF GOD.”

The first tangible object in MR. DALLAS’s account of the Institute, after enumerating among its advantages “the use of “ the Sacrament of Penance” (which MR. DALLAS’s Protest-

ant readers will inform him is no Sacrament at all), is his account of THE MISSIONS prescribed by the Institute, and prosecuted by the Jesuits,

In describing what he calls “ their sacred expeditions to “ the four quarters of the world,” he exhausts the language of eulogy;—they were “ scholars without pride”—“ disengaged from their own conveniences”—“ submissive to guidance”—“ capable of living alone, and of edifying the public—happy in solitude, content in tumult*—never misplaced,”—cum multis aliis quæ nunc perscribere longum est.

* Nothing could be more fortunate for the Jesuits than their being “ content in tumult,” since so great a part of their time was passed in the tumults which they had themselves excited. Tumult appears indeed to have been their proper element. The whole of the following History is only an account of the tumults, in which they have involved themselves, and all mankind, from their first origin; sparing neither the members of their own communion, nor the accredited head of it, when they stood in their way.—“ What other sect” (says THE BISHOP OF ANGELOPOLIS, in his Letter to POPE INNOCENT X.) “ has caused so many troubles, or sown so many divisions and jealousies; has raised so many complaints, disputes, and suits amongst the other Religious, the Clergy, the Bishops, and Secular Princes, although of the Catholic Religion? It is true, that some of the Regulars have had differences to adjust with others, but never have any had so many as the Jesuits with all the world. They have contended about penitence and mortification with the Order of Observants, and of the Barefooted; respecting the Choral service, with the Monks and Mendicants; concerning the Cloister, with the Cœnobites; respecting points of Doctrine, with the Dominicans: they have contended with Bishops about Jurisdiction; with Cathedral and Parochial Churches, as to Tithes; with Princes and Republics, respecting the government and the tranquillity of States; with Seculars, on the subject of Contracts, and of a Commerce which was at the same time unlawful: nor has the Apostolic See escaped any better than the Church in general.”—See the Letter, p. 37, Edit. Cologne, 1666.

After this testimony will MR. DALLAS still contend, that “ Bishops and their Clergy every where regarded the Jesuits as their most useful auxiliaries in the sacred ministry?”—See p. 177 of his Defence of the Jesuits.

Speaking of what he calls “ their new Colonies of civilized “ cannibals” in Paraguay and elsewhere, MR. DALLAS says, “ Here truly flowed the milk and honey of religion, and “ human happiness. Here was realized more than philosophy “ had dared to hope.”

We have already seen what sort of milk and honey flowed in Paraguay; nor will MR. DALLAS’s reference to the account given by the Jesuit DOBRITZHOFFER of his Mission to Abiponia (p. 190) be likely to assist him in his object, more than the account given by the Spanish Catholics JUAN and ULLOA, as to Paraguay.

The following History will effectually refute the pretensions of the Jesuits to credit, on account of their Missions; which indeed were little else than covers for a subtle and ambitious policy, operating by means of commerce, and producing merely secular results. Little else can be done in this place than to refer to the History: but the following observations of the Bishop of Angelopolis, in his Letter to Pope Innocent X. are to the point of their Missions. “ What advantage” (says he), “ most Holy Father, can accrue to the Christian Religion, from the Jesuits enlightening Infidels with the faith, if they do not instruct them according to the sacred rules of so holy an Institution; if they not only cannot endure that other Religious shall teach them, however able, pious, and learned they may be, but drive them away with violence, banish them, imprison them, and treat them as the Jews treated our Lord? What Order in the Church has ever acted thus with another Order? It was surely never before seen, that any who were anxious to extend the Christian faith, and professed to announce it, have suffered themselves to be carried away by such a miserable jealousy of other skilful labourers in the vineyard, as to drive them out of it, and thus subject themselves to the risk of prejudicing the souls which were exposed to danger in consequence.” And again—after detailing the sanction given by the Jesuits in China, to all the heathen abominations

of the natives, which, by that means, actually became a part of the Christianity taught by the Jesuits in China, the Bishop observes :

“ If the Church should desire at this moment to instruct “ the Chinese anew, in the true articles of our belief, she “ would complain with justice that they had been hitherto “ deceived ; that the Jesuits have by no means preached a “ religion contrary to nature, and hostile to the flesh ; that “ the Chinese have never heard of a crucified Saviour, who was “ to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolish- “ ness—that they have never embraced the doctrine of God “ made man, treated with indignity, and nailed to the Cross, “ but of a Saviour altogether inviting, full of majesty, and “ dressed as it were by the Jesuits, in the Chinese fashion ; “ that they were given to believe they were to obey a law alto- “ gether mild, and to lead an easy and pleasant life, rejecting “ at once the Cross of mortification, and the true way of “ redemption and salvation.”—See p. 49, of the Letter, Edit. 1666.

From the above Extract it will appear, upon the testimony of a Bishop of the Romish Church, that the Jesuits did not even teach the Roman Catholic Religion, but a still more debased form of worship, utterly unworthy of the very name of Christianity—that the natives of China were not instructed even in the corrupted religion of Popery, but in something still worse, scarcely deserving the name of religion : from other parts of the Letter which have been quoted before, it appears more fully, that the Jesuits mixed pagan and idolatrous rites with the worship they taught ; while, from the above Extract, it is clear that they inculcated in China the same corrupt compliances, the same worldly standard of morals, and the same convenient toleration of human passions, and heathen vices, as they promulgated with so much success in Europe under the name and with the sanction of RELIGION !

The Mission of XAVIER, the apostle of the Jesuits, to INDIA (as will appear hereafter), partook precisely of the same secular

character, and was any thing else than a display of the fundamental truths of Christianity. In JAPAN they appear to have had no other object than to excite disorders, to meddle with affairs of State, to draw persecution upon all other Christians, and finally to accomplish the annihilation of Christianity itself in that vast Empire *. In MALABAR, they authorized the most superstitious and indecent practices: and they appear in all their Missions to have waged open war with all other Missionaries, with Vicars Apostolic, Papal Legates, and Catholic Bishops; for the purpose, as it should seem, of having neither judges nor witnesses of the disorders they occasioned.

It further appears, that whenever their interest required it, they put into practice, upon these Missions, the same principles of moral casuistry as their brethren taught and observed in Europe †, particularly the lawfulness of killing those who opposed their Order; and that, for the purpose of ridding themselves of such as obstructed their operations, they exercised such cruelties as are unknown among ordinary persecutors ‡.

It may be further observed, that the enormities of the

* As to the conduct of the Jesuits in Japan, and the consequences of their behaviour, so far as the interests of Christianity were concerned, see (in addition to other testimonies noticed before) the Letter of the Pope's Legate SOTELUS, written in his imprisonment, to Pope URBAN VIII. and dated 20th January, 1624.

† In this particular, the Jesuits shewed themselves worthy rivals of their Brethren of the same Church, which is one and indivisible, and is consistent in its errors in places and periods however remote from each other; and which, therefore, having never disavowed those destructive dogmas which are peculiarly levelled against Protestants, would leave us no more to hope in this age of light and science from the tender mercies of Popery, than our ancestors experienced formerly.

‡ See in proof of the above facts the writings of *MM. des Missions étrangères*—the *Anecdotes des Affaires de la Chine*, particularly the documents transmitted by *M. de Montigny*, to the author of those Anecdotes—the *Mémoires Historiques du Père Norbert*—and *Lettres de M. Favre*.

Jesuit Missionaries in CHINA and MALABAR called forth a formal Bull of POPE CLEMENT XI. against them, and also a Charge of the CARDINAL DE TOURNON, enforcing its execution; but both the Pope and the Cardinal might have spared them selves the trouble of issuing their decrees against such refractory subjects, for neither of them were attended to.

The Jesuit LAINEZ, on his return to Malabar, from an embassy to Rome, whither he had gone to plead for the continuance of the idolatrous Rites, solemnly assured the people, in his character of their Bishop, that the Pope had declared for those Rites; and the Jesuit BOUCHET confirmed the same statement publicly, declaring at the Sacramental Table, that he had it from the Pope himself*; assertions which good Catholics must either believe to be absolutely false, or else consent to believe that the Pope could sanction Idolatry, and tolerate indecency.

One fact more shall suffice on the subject of the Missions of the Jesuits. The celebrated SERRY asserted, in his examination of the Pope's Bull against the Chinese Idolatry, that the Jesuits of the Island of Chio in the Archipelago permitted their converts there the exterior observance of MAHOMETANISM, on condition of their retaining *within*, a belief in Jesus Christ; that these Fathers administered the Sacraments there, in secret, to the females who lived in this criminal dissimulation, and that such impious abuse was not discovered till the year 1694. The Jesuits having asserted that this charge was false, the Archbishop of Corinth, who was on the spot at the time of the discovery, confirmed its truth by a declaration dated the 4th of June, 1710, which was also strengthened by other declarations to the same effect †.

Thus much may suffice respecting the Missions of the Jesuits, together with what follows on the same subject in the succeeding History; and there can be little doubt that the

* See *Mémoires Historiques du Père Norbert*, part i. book 5.

† See the Bishop's Declaration entire, in a work published in 1710, entitled, *Le Mahometisme toléré par les Jesuites dans l'Isle de Chio*.

whole taken together, especially when considered in connexion with the authorities which are produced, in support of it, will afford a satisfactory answer to the various assertions on the subject of Missions, which are abundantly scattered throughout the work of MR. DALLAS, but which appear in a somewhat less desultory form, from p. 173 to p. 193, of his Book.

Should the readers of this Reply to MR. DALLAS be disposed to believe the counter-statement, which it presents in opposition to his view of the advantages resulting from Jesuitical Missions, they may, while they apply to those Missions the query quoted by MR. DALLAS, from Virgil,

“ *Quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?* ”

be also inclined to apply to them another query from Juvenal, rather more illustrative of the character of those Missions,

“ *Quando uberior vitiorum copia?* ”

In proceeding with his view of the advantages of the Institute, MR. DALLAS comes (in p. 193) to consider the question of EDUCATION, which he calls “ one of the prominent features of the Jesuits’ Institute.” “ Their founder” (he says) “ saw that the disorders of the world, which he wished to correct, spring chiefly from neglect of Education. He perceived that the fruits of the other Spiritual functions of his Society would be only temporary, unless he could perpetuate them through every rising generation, as it came forward in succession. Every professed Jesuit was bound by a special vow to attend to the instruction of youth ; and this duty was the peculiar function, the first important Mission, of the younger members who were preparing themselves for profession.”—Again : “ The object of Ignatius, in charging his Society with the management of boys and youths, as it is announced in various parts of the Institute, was to form and perfect their will, their conscience, their morals, their manners, their memory, imagination, and reason.”—Again : “ Religion is the most engaging and most powerful restraint upon rising and growing passions ; and to imprint it deeply

in the heart, was the main business of the Jesuits' Schools : " the principles of religion were there instilled, while the elements of learning were unfolded." With much more of assertion to the same purpose.—See pp. 193 to 210, and from 240 to 257.

The whole of MR. DALLAS's observations upon THE EDUCATION OF THE JESUITS resolve themselves into two great questions, which require distinct consideration ; 1st, The nature of the Education inculcated by the Jesuits, so far as science and literature were concerned, and how far the cultivation of the human mind was advanced by that particular system of Education ; and 2dly, What kind of Religion was taught by the Jesuits, and whether mankind at large were the better for such a Religion as they obtained through the instrumentality of the Jesuits.

With regard to the first of these points ; the Education afforded by the Jesuits was undoubtedly of a contracted and limited kind, calculated only to promote their own advancement in the world, but not to form scholars of their pupils upon an extended scale ; not to instruct men in the superior parts of knowledge, nor to give them those large and exalted views which eminently distinguish the greatest and wisest of our species, from those metaphysicians and theologians, who, while they may have dazzled the ignorant with a parade of scholastic learning, were themselves untaught in all the higher and nobler departments of science. Mathematical and physical learning, philology, criticism, and rhetoric, were among the chief pursuits and attainments of the Jesuits ; while all that related to the moral sciences, the faculties, the duties, and the privileges of man, all that regarded his peculiar relations with Society, or affected the general interests of his nature, was studiously kept out of sight by the Jesuits, as hostile to an exclusive system, and injurious to the interests of its professors. The nature of the EDUCATION of the Jesuits is, however, so ably described by VILLERS, in his celebrated TREA-

TISE ON THE REFORMATION, that it cannot be too much admired :

“ The Jesuits were put in possession of the principal direction of public instruction in all Catholic countries. Europe had tasted of the tree of knowledge ; light was diffused on all sides, and had made rapid progress. It had become impossible to oppose it directly. The most salutary expedient now was, no longer to attack science, but to manage it in such a manner as to prevent its becoming hurtful. As the torrent could no longer be excluded, it was necessary to dig for it a channel in which it might fertilize, instead of desolating, the territory of the Church. To well-informed adversaries, therefore, the Court of Rome resolved to oppose defenders equally well-informed. To satisfy the universal desire for knowledge manifested by the age, they destined the artful companions of Ignatius. In this province it was that the inconceivable talents of the new Instructors of the human species were displayed. Their directing principle was, to cultivate, and carry to the highest possible degree of perfection, all those kinds of knowledge from which no immediate danger could result to the system of the hierarchical power ; and to acquire, by this means, the character and renown of the most able and learned personages in the Christian world. By means of this command of the opinions of men, it became easy for them either to prevent the growth of those branches of knowledge which might bear fruit dangerous to the Papal power, or to bend, direct, and graft upon them at their pleasure. Thus, by inspiring a taste for classical learning, profane history, and mathematics, they contrived dexterously to extinguish the taste for inquiry into matters of religion and state, the spirit of philosophy and investigation. The philosophy taught in their schools was calculated to excite aversion and disgust. It was no other than the scholastic system, revived and corrected by them, applied to present circumstances, and to the controversy with the Reformers ; whose arguments, it may well be supposed,

“ were always there presented in a manner to fall before
“ the artillery of the Schools. With regard to the study of
“ Religion, it was confined to the books of theology composed
“ for that purpose by the members of the Society, to the Ca-
“ suists, and the Jesuitical moralists. The study of the ori-
“ ginal Charters of Religion was prevented; or if the Gos-
“ pels and other pieces appeared sometimes in the books of de-
“ votion (and this it was impossible to avoid, when the trans-
“ lations given by the Protestants were public), they were ac-
“ companied with interpretations, and even alterations, suit-
“ able to the main views of the Society. Their great watch-
“ word was, the utility of the sciences, and the beauty of the
“ belles lettres. All that relates to the moral improvement;
“ to the ennobling of human nature; all that relates to the
“ philosophical and theological sciences, the Jesuits endeavour-
“ ed, and in reality were enabled, to retain in oblivion; to
“ render theology as well as philosophy a barbarous system
“ of subtleties, and even ridiculous to men of the world.
“ How can it be determined to what a degree this Jesuitical
“ mode of instruction, which became the prevailing mode
“ in Catholic countries, and differs so prodigiously from the
“ mode of instruction among Protestants, modified the
“ species of culture, and the particular turn of mind in Ca-
“ tholic countries, so different in general from what is dis-
“ covered in the Protestant? From all this, however, it fol-
“ lows (and this consideration appears to me the key to the
“ very contradictory judgments passed on the plans of the
“ Jesuits in the cultivation of the sciences) that this So-
“ ciety performed immense services to certain parts of litera-
“ ture, which it improved; but that, on the other hand, it
“ retained, designedly, certain other important parts in the
“ dark, or so obstructed the avenues to them with thorns,
“ that nobody was tempted to enter. Thus, considered gene-
“ rally, the instruction given in their schools, very brilliant in
“ one respect, continued very dark in another, was a system
“ partial, incomplete, and which set the mind in a wrong di-

“ rection. But as, on the one side, all was clearness and illumination, and on the other all mystery and obscurity, the eyes of men were naturally directed to the illuminated side, and disdained to dwell upon the other, which they acquired the habit of considering as altogether insignificant.

“ To model Science according to the interests of the Pontifical power, and render even Science ignorant in all things in which it was requisite that she should be ignorant; to produce some things in the clearest light, and to retain others in the thickest darkness; to fertilize the kingdoms of the memory and the imagination, by rendering that of thought and reason barren; to form minds submissive, without being ignorant of any thing but what could affect their submission; like those highly valued slaves of the great men of antiquity, who were grammarians, rhetoricians, poets, fine dancers, and musicians, and knew every thing except how to become free; I cannot fear that I shall be contradicted by any impartial man, in stating, that such was the system of instruction adopted by the Jesuits. It was ingenious, and inimitably adapted to the end they had in view. It was calculated to form illustrious and elegant authors, learned men, orators, good Roman Catholics, Jesuits, if you please, but not Men, in the full acceptation of that term. He who became a man under their management, became so independently of that management, and in spite of it.”—See VILLER’S Essay on the Spirit and Influence of the Reformation of Luther, translated by MILL, p. 379.

After this, will MR. DALLAS ask “ what branch of human science was banished from their Schools?” (see p. 241 of the Defence of the Jesuits;) or assert that “ the whole circle of sciences was more or less cultivated among them?”—See p. 243 of his work.

In confirmation of the above views, it may be observed, that the University of Paris, on many occasions, and particularly in the Remonstrance to the King in 1724, has demon-

strated that the Jesuits only injured true science wherever they were introduced: the University of Louvain, in a Remonstrance signed by its Rector, in the year 1627, preferred precisely the same complaint, alledging, that literature did not flourish in the Schools of the Jesuits; and that University quotes their behaviour as to Education in the Universities of Treves and Mayence, of Pont-à-Mousson and Douay, in confirmation of the same fact. The University of Cracow joined in similar complaints.

“ In truth,” says MONCLAR, “ it is a species of madness to boast of the usefulness of the Jesuits in Education. They have occupied this College” (that of Aix), “ for a hundred and forty years: cast your eyes on the deplorable state of literature in this country, where the very climate is favorable to genius. The Jesuits are not men of learning: they dread and persecute those who are. They have elsewhere more celebrated Colleges—what do youth acquire in them, after wasting the most precious period of their lives? Some frivolous talents, a decided vanity, a superficial acquaintance with profane authors, and especially the poets: some practices of exterior devotion, which are soon neglected; a profound ignorance of Religion, and a deplorable want of those solid principles which form the Citizen and the Christian. THE BIBLE IS UNKNOWN TO THEIR STUDENTS: THEY WISH TO CONCEAL IT FROM THE WHOLE WORLD, SINCE THEIR OWN CONDEMNATION IS RECORDED IN THAT DIVINE VOLUME. Is it possible to believe that an Order can be useful to Religion which is so careless in inculcating its principles upon the youth who are confided to its care?”—*Plaidoyer*, p. 204.

CHALOTAIS also observes upon the Education of the Jesuits; “ I shall quote an authority respecting their Colleges which cannot be disputed—that of the Abbé GEDOUIN, who was a Jesuit for ten years. He says respecting them, in an excellent discourse on Education, printed in his *Oeuvres diverses*, ‘ I wish that their public schools would

" render themselves more serviceable by departing from an
" old routine which restricts the Education of youth within
" a sphere peculiarly narrow, and which produces very
" shallow students; for, at the end of ten years, which these
" young men have passed at College (the most precious
" part of their lives), what have they learnt, and what do
" they know? The single treatise of one Professor of the
" University (the *Traité des Etudes* of *Rollin*) has thrown
" more light over science than all the learning with which the
" Society has been occupied ever since its commencement."

MR. DALLAS must not hope to shelter himself under the allegation that the Universities were rival teachers, and, therefore, enemies of the Jesuits; since Kings, Chapters, and the highest orders of the Clergy, have declared themselves to the same effect.

IN SARDINIA, their conduct of Education, or rather their keeping Students in ignorance of every thing which it was of importance they should know, determined their King VICTOR AMADEUS, in the year 1728, to close all their Colleges at once; which he did by a public Edict, and consigned the charge of instructing youth to others. The following King, CHARLES EMANUEL, completed the work by another Decree in 1731; for the Jesuits had continued to teach in the Capital of Savoy, notwithstanding the prohibition of his father.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF VIENNA, in a Memorial which he transmitted to the Pope in 1759 (published at length in the *Suites des Nouvelles intéressantes*), complains of the deplorable state of Education where it was conducted by the Jesuits, declaring that there was scarcely any discipline among them; that they sensibly neglected the study of theology; that no watch was kept over morâls, or decency of exterior, even so far as concerned the person. He, therefore, had been obliged (he says), after giving them a year's trial (but to no purpose), to remove youths from under their care.

The Protestation published by THE CHAPTER OF LEOPOLD, in Poland, dated the 8th September, 1759, establishes

the same facts : alledging, that the Scholars of the Jesuits were undisciplined ; that it was notorious that they constantly disturbed the peace of the citizens by tumults, by attacking their houses, and despoiling the Synagogue of the Jews ; that they had occasioned to the Ecclesiastical Communities, and the other Inhabitants of the City, considerable pecuniary injury by the damage done to their property ; that their excesses were likely to be followed by worse, emboldened as they were by the privileges they claimed as a University.

THE KING OF PORTUGAL declares by his Edict, dated the 28th June, 1759, that the great object of the Jesuits in rendering themselves Directors of the Education of youth in his Kingdom, was, to throw obstacles in the progress of their studies ; in order that, after having long brought up their pupils *in ignorance, they might always retain them in a state of subjection and dependence, which was as unjust as it was pernicious.*

The same system of Education appears to have been pursued by them in their Schools and Colleges in France, so far as regards the absence of all true Philosophy, and the neglect of all useful arts. They appear to have opposed themselves at all times to the progress and improvement of the human intellect, and to have pertinaciously resisted the cultivation of real science, and the introduction of light and truth. Their larger Establishments in France were chiefly known by the immense wealth of which they were the fertile source to the Order ; or by the monstrous errors which were first taught within their walls, and afterwards diffused abroad by their disciples. It was thus, also, with their smaller seminaries : what, indeed, could be expected from Students issuing forth under such auspices ?

It was for these reasons that BORROMEY deprived them of the superintendence of the Seminary which he had first committed to their care, declaring at the same time that the Company only took an interest in what concerned its own advancement. THE BISHOP OF ANGELOPOLIS, in his Letter to

POPE INNOCENT X. inquires on the subject of Education, " What good can Fathers derive from all the Instruction that is given to their Children, if, in depriving them of their interesting society for the purpose of attaching them to themselves, they at length dismiss them with the disgrace of a very superficial instruction ? "

Perhaps, however, enough has now been said to shew that the high pretensions of the Jesuits, on the score of Education, rest upon no solid foundation: that they never took up the task of Education, except as a necessary adjunct of their own system, without which, it would most probably have speedily sunk; and that, in pursuing the task, they have confined themselves to those sciences which were calculated rather to make men partizans than scholars—were fitter to qualify them for governing the world, than for enlightening it; and for enriching themselves, than for benefiting mankind.

With respect to the second point which MR. DALLAS's remarks on Education have rendered it necessary to notice, namely, what sort of Religion was taught by the Jesuits; and whether mankind was the better for such a religion; it will be the less necessary to enlarge on this head, because it has been virtually examined already in much that has gone before. If Popery, with all its unscriptural additions and gross corruptions, could be shewn to be the religion of the Bible, even then the religion of the Jesuits, as it did not always rise even to that standard, but frequently presented a still more debased modification, both of faith and morals, than Popery itself, was far from being entitled to the eulogium which MR. DALLAS thinks fit to lavish upon it: if, however, it could be established by him, that, in the main, the Jesuits really taught the doctrines, and observed the practices of the Romish Church, what subject for exultation or ecstacy should this afford to such as possess any knowledge of, or affection for, a purer mode of faith and worship?

Until the advocates of the Jesuits are able to prove that Popery is the Religion of the Gospel, they must fail in prov-

ing that Protestants can, with any degree of propriety or consistency, advocate the zeal of the Jesuits in diffusing such a Religion, and making Converts to it; but if they can establish that Religion to be indeed the Religion of the Word of God, they will then act with far greater honesty by espousing it themselves, and ceasing to be mere nominal Protestants.

If it be meant to be asserted in this age of liberal opinions, that there is no essential difference between Popery and Protestantism, and that one is about as good as the other, let such an opinion be fairly avowed; and the Religion of the Reformation, which is at present established in this country, may at least stand a chance of faring as well in the argument as the Religion of the Church of Rome. As it is, however, the faith of the Reformed Church is avowed, indeed, by the writer of the work which has given occasion to these pages; while, from the beginning to the end of that work, a studied and systematic Defence of Popery, in the persons of its friends and adherents, is conducted with no ordinary degree of ardor and feeling. MR. DALLAS has even gone further than an avowal of attachment to THE REFORMATION in general: he has professed an attachment to THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND in particular: how far he has established those claims, has been already examined at some length; but the inquiry will not have been without its use, if it shall have proved that such professions are utterly incompatible with a Defence of the civil and religious system of the Jesuits: since it will at the same time prove that Education, as administered by Jesuits, and as administered by Protestants, are two things utterly distinct in their nature and consequences, and can no more accord with each other than light can harmonize with darkness, or sin with holiness.

We now come to the celebrated SECRETA MONITA; since MR. DALLAS, in considering the beauties of the Jesuits' Institute, adverts to the contrast between that Institute and those Secret Instructions (see p. 211).

He says little upon this subject in his work, beyond asserting that the SECRETA MONITA are a collection of "infamous

“doctrines,” and “a forgery;” and contents himself with referring to the account given of them in the Letters which appeared in the Pilot Newspaper, and the Popish Magazine. On turning to those Letters we find it asserted, that the *SECRETA MONITA* were published by “a Jesuit, who was dismissed “with ignominy from the Society in Poland for misconduct:” that “the walls of Cracow were soon covered with sheets of “revengeful insults; and in the year 1616, this outcast of “the Society published his fabricated *SECRETA MONITA*, with “a view to cover his own disgrace, or to gratify his revenge.” The writer then quotes *CORDARA*, whom he calls “an ele-“gant Historian, well known in the republic of letters” (though probably none of his readers ever heard of such a name before), in order to prove that it was an “ineptly silly “work:” after this he informs us, that it was condemned at Rome, and placed in the celebrated Index of prohibited books in the year 1616 (which, by the way, is *primâ facie* in its favor), and that it was at length victoriously refuted by *GRETSER*: after which, *MR. DALLAS* himself returns to the charge (“*ecce iterum Crispinus*”), and gives the coup-de-grace to the unfortunate *SECRETA MONITA*, by affirming, in a note, that he has “discovered after some search, that *JE-“ROME ZAROWICII* was the name of the Jesuit who forged “the *SECRETA MONITA*;” though it is not a little extraordinary that the author of the Letters in the Pilot should not have made the same discovery, since he expressly names that very Jesuit as dismissed from the Society, but without attempting to lay the sin of this forgery to his charge.

Such is the sum of the evidence produced by *MR. DALLAS* and his Clerical coadjutor against the authenticity of the *SECRETA MONITA*.

Now, it is somewhat remarkable, that, in a work in the British Museum, these *SECRETA MONITA* should be copied in Manuscript at the end of a printed work which bears for its title, “*Hæ Formulæ diversarum Provisionum à Gaspare “Passarello summo Studio in unum collectæ, et per Ordinem*

“*in suis Locis annotatae.*” That work was printed at Venice, in 1596, and the SECRETA MONITA which follow it, are (as has been observed) in Manuscript, and appear evidently to have been entered in it by a Jesuit for his own private use: they contain the solemn caution, at the end, about their being carefully guarded, communicated but to few, and those only the well-tried members of the Society; and also the injunction that they must be denied to be the Rules of the Society, if ever they should be imputed to it.

The English Edition of the SECRETA MONITA printed in 1658, is by no means of rare occurrence; and the statement prefixed to that Edition affirms that when Christian Duke of Brunswick took possession of Paderborn in Westphalia, he seized on the Jesuits’ College there, and gave their Library, together with all their collection of Manuscripts, to the Capuchins, who discovered the SECRETA MONITA among the archives of the Rector, and that other copies were also found at Prague and elsewhere.

DR. COMPTON, the celebrated and excellent Bishop of London, published an English Translation of the SECRETA MONITA in the year 1669; and he was not likely to have been imposed upon by a forgery, or to have wasted his time in misleading the public.

The Amsterdam Edition of the SECRETA MONITA, entitled, “Machiavelli Mus Jesuiticus,” was published in the year 1717, addressed to John Krausius a Jesuit, and is in the British Museum, which also contains German Editions of the SECRETA MONITA.

In the year 1722, the SECRETA MONITA were again published in London, and dedicated to Sir Robert Walpole; and a second Edition of the same work appeared in the year 1746, which was probably the last that has appeared in this country. Both these Editions have the original Latin on one page, and the English Translation on the opposite page, and they may be found in the British Museum.

A French version of the SECRETA MONITA was published

at Cologne A. D. 1727, in a volume entitled *Les Mystères les plus secrets des Jesuits contenus en diverses Pièces originales*, 12mo.

With regard to GRETSEE's denial of the authenticity of the SECRÉTA MONITA, it may be observed, that he was a thorough-paced Jesuit, who made no scruple of denying any thing which affected the credit or reputation of his Order. He was the creature of Cardinal Bellarmine, another Jesuit, who was remarkable for a resolute adherence to the interests of the Society, which he supported and defended "per fas atque "nefas." Whoever is desirous of judging of the degree of credit due to the statements of GRETSEE, has only to advert to the writings of Dr. JAMES, formerly the Keeper of the Bodleian Library; who has, on the clearest evidence, in his *Defence of the Bellum Papale*, convicted that Author of the grossest falsehood. GRETSEE has even been reproached, by the Roman Catholics themselves, with having uniformly evinced a greater desire to maintain his point in controversy, than to elucidate the subject in hand, much less to elicit the real truth.

He printed at Ingoldstadt, in 1609, a Defence of CARDINAL BELLARMINE, by which he has made his own, all the errors and excesses of that Jesuit and others, invalidating the authority and independence of Sovereign Princes: and he maintained the same doctrines himself, in a work published by him in 1610 at Mayence, and entitled *Vespertilio heretico-politicus*; where, among other things, he says, "We are not so timid and "cowardly as to be deterred from openly asserting that the "Roman Pontiff can, when necessity requires, *absolve Catholic Subjects from their oath of Allegiance*; nay, we add, that, "if this be done by the Pope with prudence and care, it is a "meritorious work. What more need to be said? This is "clearly established by Bellarmine in his Disp. de Potest. "Pont. and by other writers." See pp. 158 and 159*.

* The passage in the original runs thus: "Tam timidi et trepidi "non sumus, ut asserere palam vereamur Romanum Pontificem posse,

At best, therefore, the testimony of GRETSER in opposition to the **SECRETA MONITA**, would have been no more than the testimony of a Jesuit; but when we consider his peculiar zeal and ardour in the cause of the Society, and the inveterate habit of falsehood which he had contracted, it will be too much to expect that we should now reject the **SECRETA MONITA**, because such a writer has declared against this work.

In addition to the observations which have been adduced in support of the **SECRETA MONITA**, there appears to be some collateral evidence in favor of their genuineness from the circumstance of their being little else than an echo of the debased morality and corrupt casuistry of the Jesuits, as well as a practical exposition of their pernicious principle of the lawfulness of doing evil that good may come. It may be asserted without the hazard of refutation, that the **SECRETA MONITA** contain no Regulation which the Jesuits have not promulgated under another form, nor one which they have not actually reduced to practice. It is no more than a summary of Rules resulting from their various doctrines; which Rules, although they may strike the more forcibly from being thus collected into a single focus, may all (if taken separately, and reduced to their primitive elements) be plainly shewn to emanate from doctrines which have been avowed and acted upon by the Members of that Order, from its earliest origin.

Another circumstance which may be noticed, as furnishing farther collateral evidence to the authority of the **SECRETA MONITA** is the fact, that the Jesuits were always known to possess and act upon other rules, than those which were publicly avowed by them, and which secret Rules were understood to be confided to their Rectors and Superiors alone. The University of Paris, so far back as the year 1624, reproached the Jesuits with being “ governed by private laws neither

“ si necessitas exigat, subditos Catholicos solvere juramento fidelitatis:
 “ et addimus, si hoc à Pontifice prudenter et circumspectè fiat, esse
 “ opus meritorium. Quid vis amplius? Liquet hoc ex Disp. de Potest.
 “ Pont. apud Bellarminum, et apud alios scriptores.”

“ sanctioned by Kings, nor registered by Parliaments; and
“ which they were afraid to communicate, having done all
“ in their power to prevent their being seen by any other
“ than those of the Society.” Again, the Bishop of Angelopolis, whose letter has so often been referred to, inquires, with reference to this fact, “ What other Religion has a secret Constitution, hidden privileges, and concealed laws of its own? “ and what other has all those things which relate to its government, involved in so much mystery? There is suspicion “ in mystery. The Rules of all other Orders are open to all: “ even the Rules and Canons of Popes, Cardinals, Bishops, “ and the whole Clergy; the privileges, *instructions*, and “ statutes of other religious orders, may be seen and consulted “ in almost every Library; and the lowest novice of the “ Franciscan Order may read at one view what his duty “ would be, if he should ever become the General of his “ Order. The Superiors of the Jesuits do not govern them “ by the rules of the Church, which are known to all, but by “ certain SECRET RULES (“ *Règles Cachées*”) which are only “ known to those Superiors.” See p. 36 of the Letter, Edit. Cologne, 1666.

With regard to the improbability urged by the writer of the Letters in the Pilot, that any body of men should have adopted such corrupt maxims, or been held together by them if they did, it is equally unlikely that any Order professing Religion, should have adopted a set of morals which were at war with all Religion, or which inculcated regicide as a duty: but it is not less certain that they did so, because it is improbable that they should, or because their Defenders deny that they did; nor will the glaring absurdity of adopting a code which, in the nature of things, must be some time or other exposed, to the disgrace of its professors, afford, of itself, any positive proof against its having been adopted at all—since it has been often seen, that “ *quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat.*”

The observations upon the *SECRETA MONITA* might here

perhaps be closed, did it not appear proper to remark, in conclusion, that, could those Rules be even proved to be false and surreptitious, the question of the delinquencies of the Jesuits, both in doctrine and practice, would remain precisely the same: it is by no means necessary to those who would establish either the one or the other of those points, to contend with any pertinacity for Rules which, whether they be genuine or not, will leave every great question which is at issue between the Jesuits and others, precisely as it stood before. Such a mass of evidence will still remain, drawn from the least suspected sources, occurring in every nation where Jesuits have appeared, (and where have they not appeared?) arising out of every period of their history from its earliest to its latest date, that the world can well afford to spare all the testimony which can be supplied by the *SECRETA MONITA* without being in any degree sensible of the defalcation.

Under these circumstances it becomes the less important, whether these particular Rules are demonstrated to have been the genuine productions of the Society, and employed as such for the actual government of its members, or whether they were rather the fabrication of an Enemy, who designed by such an artifice to paint the Jesuits blacker than they really were. The truth itself will in no way be affected, if, in balancing this great question, we should determine to place these Rules neither in one scale nor the other, but resolve to lay them entirely out of our consideration. They resemble, in this particular, the famous disputed passage in St. John's 1st Epistle (*ch. v. v. 7*); which may, without reluctance, be given up by those who believe in, and maintain, the Doctrine of the Trinity, without their fearing to concede any thing which can, in the remotest degree, either affect their own faith, or invalidate the doctrine itself—since there will still remain innumerable proofs, all incontestably establishing the same great truth, from the beginning of the Bible to its end.

MR. DALLAS (in page 226 et seq.) presents a most fallacious view of the *present* state of the Jesuits in *this Country*,

and one which is calculated to deceive and to mislead the public in no ordinary degree.

He states, that, on the destruction of their College at Liege, in the year 1794, “A FEW of these ancient men who “had weathered the Storm, having availed themselves of the “indulgence of the British Government, on leaving the Netherlands, sought an asylum in their own country, and that “they here subsist in the security of conscious innocence.”

If, in making this statement, MR. DALLAS was ignorant of the large Establishment of Jesuits, which has subsisted for the last thirty years in the heart of our Protestant Empire, he was altogether unqualified for the office which he has assumed, of affording information on the subject of the Jesuits: if, on the other hand, MR. DALLAS was aware of the facts which are about to be noticed, the suppression of those facts bears a far more culpable aspect. It remains for him to decide which of these remarks apply to the erroneous and defective representation which he has thought proper to afford to the public.

Judging from his poetical statement, it would appear that A FEW old and weatherbeaten men, who had escaped the revolutionary storms of the Continent, had adopted the language which SHAKSPEARE puts into the mouth of WOLSEY*, and had thrown themselves upon the commiseration which it was impossible they could abuse.

Now, how does the fact really stand? A reference to the extensive and increasing Establishment of Jesuits at Stonyhurst, near Preston in Lancashire, will best answer the question: at this place the Order of Jesuits has for thirty years past possessed a spacious College, which is EXCLUSIVELY a College of JESUITS; is amply provided with all the *materiel* and *morale* of Jesuitism, and is carrying on the Work of Catholic Instruction, and Protestant Conversion, upon the most large and extensive scale! The studies at this place are con-

* “An old man broken with the storms of State
“Is come to lay his weary bones among you;
“Give him a little earth for Charity.”

ducted upon the same system, and to the same extent, as at the Catholic Universities abroad; and there are regular professors in Divinity, Mathematics, Philosophy, Astronomy, &c. The College, which is a very large Building, is capable of containing at least four or five hundred pupils independently of Professors, Managers, and domestics. It is supposed to contain at this time five hundred or more Individuals of various descriptions.

About eleven hundred acres of land are attached to the College, which the Jesuits keep in their own hands, and farm themselves. A Jesuit (who would be called, in a similar situation in a Nobleman's Family, the Land Steward) has the direction and management of the Land, with a very liberal Salary, besides board and accommodation. The Jesuits consume the produce of the Land in the College, and also make large purchases in addition, from the Farmers and Graziers for many miles round; from which circumstance, their influence is considerably augmented, and their principles are widely diffused throughout the Country. Adjoining to the College, they have suitable Offices for all manner of Tradesmen and Artificers, such as Tailors, Shoemakers, Smiths, Carpenters, Butchers, Bakers, &c.

They have Pupils from various parts of the Continent; from Ireland and from different parts of Great Britain: they have, of course, a correspondence with most parts of the world, and they adopt particular precautions with regard to their Letters. Their present number of Pupils may be from two to three hundred, and the general average for the last twenty-five years cannot have fallen far short of that number.

At Hirst Green, within a quarter of a mile of the College of Stonyhurst, is a Seminary for boarding and educating young boys, preparatory to their entering the College of Stonyhurst. The apartments and grounds of this initiatory Establishment, are appropriated solely to those who are destined for the superior College; and the almost entire seclusion of these youths from all intercourse with mankind, which takes

place during their probationary studies, is not calculated to remove the distrust and apprehension which are naturally excited by the mystery which attaches more or less to Jesuitism in general, and to this fact in particular.

The amount of the accumulating Capital of the Jesuits is very considerable, arising from the value of their Estate, and the annual profit accruing from their Pupils *.

The influence of the Jesuits in the adjacent Country is incredible: the Manor and surrounding district being their own, they are more or less the accredited heads of the neighbourhood; they are at once bold and indefatigable in making Proselytes; and, in consequence of their exertions, Popery has very considerably increased in the vicinity of Stonyhurst, and in the town of Preston, within the last thirty years.

Before the establishment of this College, there were not half a dozen Papists about Stonyhurst, but now the greater portion of the Population in that part of the Country are Papists to the amount of many thousands. From this Jesuits' College *all the Roman Catholic Chapels in that part of the Kingdom (which are nearly as numerous as the Protestant Churches) are filled with Priests of the Order of Jesuits*, though they are unwilling it should be known that they are any other than ordinary Romish Priests. There are several Jesuit Priests stationed in Preston, who frequently travel from thence to Ireland; and, since the last peace, they have great intercourse with France, and other parts of the Continent.

* A considerable part of the Land attached to the College was granted to the Jesuits as a free gift; the other part is held by them at a low rent: the whole Estate is of great value, and they have already possessed it nearly thirty years. Their Pupils (as has been observed above) have, for the last twenty-five years, averaged from about two to three hundred: and their gain by each Pupil (after every expense is paid) forms no inconsiderable addition to their annual revenue; to say nothing of the original endowment from which they derived their support in the first instance.

The principal Jesuit Priest of Preston now makes a boast, that when he first came into it (a little more than twenty years since) a small room would have contained his whole congregation: at this time, he proclaims with triumph that two large Chapels have been built which will hold two thousand persons each, and that even these Chapels will not contain their congregations. From this fact, some idea may be gained of the extent to which they have proselyted in one Parish.

The Jesuits and Papists, in conjunction, have within the last eighteen months erected a large School (with an excellent house at each end, for the accommodation of the Master and Mistress), upon the plan of our National Schools, for the reception of children of both sexes: this School will hold about a thousand children. The Members of Parliament for Preston, and some Clergymen as well as several other nominal Protestants, have contributed large donations towards this School !

The subtilty with which the Jesuits insinuate themselves into Protestant families of fortune is very remarkable, but quite in unison with their whole history: there is scarcely a single Protestant family of respectability which is not in a greater or less degree under the influence of the Jesuits. The Bishop of the Diocese himself, has not escaped the vortex of their influence; and a relative of his, who is a beneficed Clergyman, at no great distance from the College, is openly boasted of, by the Jesuits, as their Patron and Ally: to this list may be added some of the established Clergy of Preston and its vicinity. The Jesuits rule the Magistrates of that place completely, and the Mayor himself is in their interest.

They have regularly preached in Preston against the Protestant Church and Faith, for a series of years past; more especially during the season of Lent; and for this purpose they have selected some of their most able preachers.

Such is the influence of the Jesuits in Preston, that the Protestant Booksellers are afraid to sell publicly, or expose for sale, any books against Popery; and yet there is a Popish

Bookseller in the Town, whose windows and shop are crowded with all the poison of Popery.

MR. DALLAS, indeed, observes of these persons—" they " have pledged their allegiance to their King and Country, in " the comprehensive oath of 1791 ;" but he would have some trouble to prove that any Oath of Allegiance whatever is taken by his *protégés*, either as Jesuits or as Romish Priests. If, however, he could establish this, he would not succeed in allaying our just apprehensions, unless he could at the same time disprove that the Pope possesses, in the estimation of all good Catholics, a dispensing power with respect to Oaths ; and unless he could further shew that Oaths made to Heretics, are not binding in cases where the keeping them would affect the interests of the Holy Roman Church. Let it even be conceded that the Catholics (whether of the Order of Jesuits or not) may bind themselves by Oaths, which shall admit the supremacy of a reigning Protestant Monarch, and their allegiance to him as such; still the very nature of their religious system will preclude them from assigning any other than a subordinate and secondary rank to such admitted principles, while, at the same time, doctrines of higher obligation must necessarily retain the superior place in their affections, and command obedience in the first degree ; a fact, which no man will be hardy enough to deny, who is in the slightest degree conversant with English History, or with the avowed principles of the Romish Church. In this sense, the Protestant may address the Jesuit, however bound by Oaths, or pledged by securities, in the expressive language of the Poet of France, in his BAJAZET :

" Promettez—affranchi du péril qui vous presse ;

" Nous verrons de quel poids sera yotre promesse."

So far, however, from its being true, that the Jesuit Priests are bound by any oath, which affords the least protection or security to a Protestant Church and State, the fact is that the Oath which Pope Pius IV. and the Council of Trent prescribed to be taken by every Priest, is directly opposite both to

the existence and interests of that Church and State; and must oblige him, if he be an honest and consistent member of his own communion, to interminable hostility with each. This Oath is couched in the form of a profession of faith; it is entitled “**FORMA JURAMENTI PROFESSIONIS FIDEI**,” and is in the commencement expressly enjoined by Papal authority to be taken by “all having the care of Souls.” It contains a distinct and formal avowal on the part of the person subscribing it, of his firm belief in the various errors of the Romish Church; such, for instance, as the doctrine of Tradition being of equal authority with Scripture—the exclusive right of the Romish Church to determine the true sense of Scripture—the divine Institution and efficacy of the Seven Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, the Lord’s Supper, Penitence, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony—the entire acquiescence in, and consent to, every thing which was fixed and prescribed by the Council of Trent—the belief in the Mass being a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the dead and the living—the doctrine of Transubstantiation in all its fulness—the certain existence of Purgatory, and the necessity of praying souls out of it—the positive duty of worshipping and praying to the Saints—the certainty and validity of their intercessions, and the obligation of worshipping their relics—the duty of preserving images of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, and of certain Saints, and of honouring and worshipping those Images—the belief in the power of Indulgences having been committed by Christ to his Church, and in the essential utility of Indulgences to Christians—**THE COMPLETE SUPREMACY AND PARAMOUNT AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY ROMAN CHURCH OVER ALL OTHER CHURCHES, AND A DECLARATION OF THE MOST ENTIRE AND UNQUALIFIED OBEDIENCE TO THE POPE, AS THE SUCCESSOR AND VICAR OF CHRIST; AS WELL AS A FULL ACQUIESCENCE IN, AND SUBMISSION TO, WHATEVER HAS BEEN SETTLED BY THE CANONS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME, BY ITS ECUMENICAL COUNCILS, AND ESPECIALLY BY THE COUNCIL OF TRENTE; AT THE SAME TIME CONDEMNING, REJECTING, AND**

ANATHEMATIZING all things contrary thereto, and all Heresies which the Church of Rome condemns, rejects, and anathematizes:—in conclusion, that this is the true Catholic Faith, “OUT OF WHICH NO ONE CAN BE SAVED,” which the party subscribing such profession expressly holds, and engages for ever to preserve and maintain whole and inviolate; and which he declares, vows, and swears he will, to the utmost of his power, see that all who are subjected to him, or committed to his care, shall hold, teach, and preach *.

* This Sacerdotal Oath will be found at length, in the Bull of Pius IV. dated in November, 1564, and published at Rome, on the 6th December following. It occurs in the “*Sacrosanctum Concilium Tridentinum*,” as well as in almost every account of the acts of the Council of Trent, and the measures to which it led. The Oath is too long for insertion in a note, but the following Extract from it, may not be unacceptable: “ Profiteor pariter, in Missa offerri Deo verum, proprium, “ et propitiatorium sacrificium pro vivis et defunctis, atque in sanctis “ simæ Eucharistiae Sacramento esse vere, realiter et substantialiter “ corpus et sanguinem, una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri “ Jesu Christi; fierique conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, “ et totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, quam conversionem Catholica “ Ecclesia Transubstantiationem appellat. Fateor etiam sub altera “ tantum specie totum atque integrum Christum, verumque Sacra-“ mentum sumi. Constanter teneo, Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi “ detentas fidelium suffragiis juvari; similiter et Sanctos, una cum “ Christo regnantes, venerandos atque invocandos esse, eosque ora-“ tiones Deo pro nobis offerre, atque eorum Reliquias esse venerandas. “ Firmissime assero, imagines Christi, ac Deiparæ semper Virginis, nec “ non aliorum Sanctorum, habendas et retinendas esse, atque eis debi-“ tum honorem, ac venerationem impertiendam. Indulgentiarum etiam “ potestatem, à Christo in Ecclesia relictam fuisse, illarumque usum “ Christiano populo maxime salutarem esse, affirmo. Sanctam Catho-“ licam et Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam, omnium Ecclesiarum “ matrem et magistrum agnoseo; Romanoque Pontifici, Beati Petri, “ Apostolorum principis, successori, ac Jesu Christi Vicario, veram “ obedientiam spondeo, ac juro: cætera item omnia à sacris Canonibus, “ et Ecumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipue à sacrosancta Tridentina Synodo “ tradita, definita, et declarata indubitanter recipio, atque profiteor; “ simulque contraria omnia, atque hæreses quascumque ab Ecclesia “ damnatas, rejectas & anathematizatas, ego pariter damno, rejicio, et

If any one should be disposed to think that such a juridical profession of faith as the above, or any similar profession, can consist with attachment to a *Protestant King and Government*, he is at perfect liberty to enjoy that opinion; but it appears so impossible that such an opinion should be supported by any one sound argument, that it may perhaps be safely left to its own fate.

There are two observations which naturally arise out of the above statement: the first is, the magnitude and danger of such an Establishment as this in our own country, in the present state of its continental connexions, in the perturbed condition of Ireland, and in the sensible increase of Popery within our own realm *. If Jesuitism, like her twin-sister Popery, continue what she has been ever since History has recorded her crimes, it is then a matter of no common importance, that such a Society should thus have gained so strong and central a position; should be proceeding unmolested in the holy work of proselytism; and should be annually turning loose upon this

“*anathematizo. Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in præsenti sponte profiteor, et veraciter teneo eamdem integrum et inviolatam, usque ad extremum vitæ spiritum, constantissime (Deo adjuvante) retinere et confiteri; atque à meis subditis, vel illis, quorum cura ad me in munere meo spectabit, teneri, doceri, et prædicari, quantum in me erit, curaturum, ego idem spondeo, voveo, ac juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet, et hæc sancta Dei Evangelia.*” SACROSANC. CONC. TRID. Patavii, 1760, 8vo. p. 312. Superiorum Permissu, et Privilegio.

* The proportion of Catholics in Ireland is as $3\frac{1}{4}$ millions to 1 million of Protestants: the total number of Catholics in England and Wales cannot possibly be estimated at less than half a million, of which number there are above 50,000 in London and its vicinity.—Every County in England has Catholic Chapels and Congregations: by far the greatest number of these Chapels have been erected within the last twenty-five years, and there are at this time hardly fewer than a thousand; in which number, however, the private Chapels of Catholic families are not included. In the Summer of 1813, there were confirmed in the three Towns of Manchester, Liverpool, and Preston, alone, 3000 children.

nation so large a number of disciples, imbued with all the doctrinal and practical errors which have been superadded by Jesuitism to the native corruptions of Popery. It would be absurd to suppose that all this influence has been acquired for nothing; that so many converts have been made, and so many scholars trained, without an object; and that an Establishment whose plan is method itself, and whose union is well worthy even of our own imitation, should be thus concentrating its forces and talents, augmenting its influence and funds, and multiplying its converts and adherents, without danger to our *Protestant* Church and State!!! Under these circumstances, it is not surely too much to assert, that among the many objects for which this country has a right to look for protection to its Parliament, as the natural guardian of its religious and political liberties, there is perhaps no one which stands out more prominently, which is pregnant with greater danger to this nation, or calls for more prompt remedies on the part of its Legislature, than the revival of the Order of Jesuits.

In the second place, it may be observed, that nothing can more clearly evince the careless indifference and unsuspecting liberality of Protestants, so called, than the support which they are thus affording to the natural and avowed foes of their own religious and civil establishment. We find from the above relation, that some of our own Protestant Clergy, some of the Protestant members of our Legislature, the Protestant Magistrates of an ancient and honourable Corporation, and some of the most opulent and respectable of our Country Gentlemen, are content to open their arms to the Jesuits; can consent to advocate their cause, to support their Schools, and to advance their interests: they find these characters persons of talent; are pleased with their society, and inquire no farther: wearing their own religion but loosely about them, they can hardly conceive that the professors of another religion would proceed any undue lengths, or make any unworthy sacrifices, to promote their own faith: themselves the professors of a tolerant faith, they will not believe that the men whom they find so amiable and

harmless without power, would become intolerant and persecuting upon principle, if power were placed in their hands: caring but little, themselves, whether men are Catholics or Protestants, and indeed scarcely knowing in what those systems differ, or whether they differ at all, except in name, they would not take the trouble of crossing the street in order to convert a man from Popery to Protestantism; and therefore can form no idea of the indefatigable vigilance and proportionate success, with which the Jesuits (like their prototypes, the Pharisees of old) "compass sea and land, to make one "proselyte." Themselves loyal to their king and attached to regular government and good order, they are unwilling to think so ill of any men, as that they could betray the country which protects them; and observing, as yet, no overt acts of sedition or treason on the part of the Jesuits, they will not believe that any opportunity can ever arrive, which will be more favorable to the developement of the Jesuits' talents in this way, than the present. Being themselves men of candour and liberal sentiment, they entertain no doubt, that while they and their Protestant countrymen have been so eminently benefited by the increased light and civilization of the age, all others will have derived advantage in the same proportion; and never suspecting that Popery is unchanged and unchangeable, they are disposed to refer all the atrocities and abominations with which its Professors have been charged, rather to the darkness and ignorance of a barbarous *æra*, than to the radical and fundamental errors of their *religious system*.

"Several persons" (says Dean MILNER), "and even some of our leading Senators, suppose that Popery has long since been abundantly meliorated; but I wish *they* may not be nearer the truth, who think that the spirit of Protestantism "has greatly degenerated."—See Milner's Preface to 5th Vol. of his History of the Church of Christ.

The good-natured Protestants of Lancashire do not stand alone in these erroneous conclusions: they may be taken as a fair specimen of a large proportion of the British nation, over

which a sort of judicial infatuation appears to be cast; and which, unless it should awake to a sense of its proper interests, and its real danger, will sooner or later have abundant cause to regret its apathy, when perhaps it will be too late. The fact is, that it is now so long since Popery had power in this highly-favored land to shut up our Bibles and to open our Prisons, that we are wholly forgetful of the miseries she once inflicted, and almost insensible of the privileges we now enjoy. Let it never be forgotten, however, that we are only as great and free as we are, because we have the happiness to be ruled by a Protestant Monarch, to be represented by a Protestant Parliament, to live under a Protestant Government, and to be protected by Protestant Laws, which are administered by Protestant Judges, Juries, and Magistrates. If the Protestant advocates for Catholic Emancipation should succeed in their present object, the whole face of things must in no long period undergo such a change as will convince the patrons and partizans of the Jesuits in Lancashire and elsewhere, that, as the want of power on the part of the Catholics was the secret spring of all the clamour for Emancipation, so the possession of power by the same parties will be a far more formidable thing, than, in the plenitude of their liberality, they have ever dreamt. Nor let this opinion be branded with want of charity, or be thought to originate in harshness and prejudice: the proof of its correctness will be found in the present work; the generalizing and latitudinarian spirit which cherishes the Jesuits, and would invest them with power, is not charity of a legitimate kind—which, to be charity at all, should “begin at home.” The lax and indiscriminate favor, which embraces, without distinction, the worst classes of offenders, will never be thought to provide sufficiently for its own security. There is a false and prurient species of charity, which, however specious in appearance, and however common at the present moment, is but the bastard and counterfeit of another, and a nobler principle. If the charity which would affect to comprise the whole world, at the same time

overlooks and despises the claims of its near kindred ; and, while it professes to take in all the human race, spurns and slight the superior duties which stand in the first relation, and are of the highest importance ; we need be at no loss to determine the character of this species of charity. It may be ignorance ; it may be impolicy ; it may be infatuation ; it is any thing else than the legitimate charity of Christianity.

Should the present mischievous and fatal security continue, it requires not the spirit of prophecy to see that the time is fast approaching when the Monarch of the British Empire will have cause to adopt the pathetic exclamation :

—“ *Ejectos littore, egenos*
“ *Excepi ; et regni DEMENS in parte locavi.* ” VIRGIL.

On arriving at MR. DALLAS's fourth Chap. (p. 229), it becomes necessary to remark that he makes abundant use through his work of the name of POMBAL : as in other instances, the Letters first printed in the Pilot Newspaper and Popish Journal, furnished him with a hint on this matter, which he has not failed to improve, by raising such a cloud of dust about this Portuguese Minister, as to render it very difficult to those who merely read his book to understand any part of POMBAL's history ; whether as affecting the part taken by him against the Jesuits, or the conduct of the Jesuits themselves on that occasion.

In the Dedication to MR. CANNING, MR. DALLAS calls POMBAL “ the unprincipled and unrelenting Minister of Joseph I. of Portugal : ” and although he states that MR. CANNING is “ on the spot where the Jesuits were persecuted with “ the greatest violence, ” yet he doubts whether the prejudices which were raised on this subject, may not hinder even MR. CANNING himself (who is called “ the liberal advocate of the “ Catholic body ”) from understanding this question, or coming at the truth respecting it ; and therefore kindly puts him on his guard against those prejudices. In p. 12 of the Preface the ghost of POMBAL rises again, but only to vanish as speedily.

This is again the case in p. 16; only that, in the latter instance, he is called “an arbitrary Minister who chose to take “the conscience of his Prince under his own care” (a crime, it is presumed, of which the Jesuit Confessors were never guilty). In p. 97, POMBAL appears again, but only for the purpose of shewing that somebody was his “devoted creature;” in p. 111, POMBAL just shews himself, but immediately disappears as before; in p. 141, he appears in the new character of a Dictator; in p. 155, he is called “the great enemy of the “Jesuits, and of every virtue.” In p. 163, we find him intriguing for gold-mines, exchanging territories, and endeavouring to transport the whole Indian population of Paraguay a thousand miles off, at a quarter’s notice; of which a mournful story is related from an anonymous work of no authority, entitled, *Memoirs of the Marquis of Pombal*, which never appeared till the year 1784, when POMBAL was dead and could not answer it. MR. DALLAS’s grand attack upon POMBAL is, however, reserved for his fourth Chapter, at which we are now arrived in course; where we find this Minister “determined “to ruin the Jesuits”—“persecuting them”—“imputing the “disorder among the Indians to their influence, and ambition”—“propagating an absurd fable about King Nicholas “all over Europe, with great industry and many foul arts”—“ambitiously engrossing all authority and power”—“inspiring “the King with jealousy of his own brother”—“then vowing “vengeance against the King, his Jesuit Confessor, and the “whole Order of Jesuits”—“sending his brother, a despotic “and outrageous tyrant, to the Brazils”—“almost driven mad “by the accusations of the Jesuits against his brother”—ab- “horring the Jesuits for their admirable conduct after the “earthquake”—“assuring the King that a conspiracy was “formed to overturn the government, and that unless Mala- “guida the Jesuit were withdrawn, a public sedition would “ensue”—“and keeping the King in constant dread of ima- “ginary plots, conspiracies, and insurrections”—after which he “became absolute, and displayed his real character in such a

“ series of despotic and tyrannical deeds as the annals of man-
“ kind cannot equal.”

Now, in the whole course of the above posthumous Bill of Attainder against this Portuguese Minister, the least hint at the real cause of the banishment of the Jesuits from Portugal during his Ministry, is studiously kept out of sight by MR. DALLAS. The attempted assassination of THE KING OF PORTUGAL in the year 1758, which led to the expulsion of the Jesuits, with MALAGRIDA at their head, is not so much as hinted at; and notwithstanding this gross suppression of one of the most public and notorious facts of modern History, MR. DALLAS, it seems, presumes that he shall succeed in involving a very plain question in such intricacy and confusion, that, with all this dust in our eyes, we shall be unable to see into the real merits of the case. The following statement may perhaps throw some light on this subject.

JOSEPH MASCARENHAS, DUKE OF AVEIRO, was one of the first noblemen of Portugal, by his birth, his wealth, and his reputation. During the reign of JOHN V. he possessed unlimited power; but having on the accession of his successor JOSEPH declined in favor, he formed the design of an attempt on the person of that Monarch: he endeavoured to influence all who had any subject of complaint, and to incite them to action by the most unfounded calumnies.

It had happened, in the preceding reign, that CARVALHO MARQUIS OF POMBAL had brought to Lisbon, from Vienna (where he had been employed on a secret embassy), a lady of rank as his wife: the then QUEEN OF PORTUGAL, Maria Ann of Austria, became much attached to this lady, and interested herself greatly in order to procure some appointment for her husband the MARQUIS DE POMBAL; but in vain. On the death, however, of JOHN V. which happened on the 30th of July, 1750, the Queen had more success with her son JOSEPH, who immediately on his succession appointed the Marquis his Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and this was the beginning of the resentment which the DUKE OF AVEIRO conceived.

The MARQUIS DE POMBAL gained by degrees the entire confidence of the King, and, relying on the credit he had acquired, ventured to oppose the marriage of the presumptive heiress of the Crown, with DON PEDRO the King's brother, although JOHN V. had applied to Rome for a Dispensation for that marriage. This opposition excited against him some powerful enemies, and his resolute character increased their number.

Some persons of distinction, among whom were the DUKE OF AVEIRO (who, as has been noticed, was smarting under the slight he had received), conspired against THE MARQUIS DE POMBAL, and THE KING. The Duke, in order to accomplish his purpose, connected himself with the Jesuits; who, having some time before, lost their credit at the Court of Portugal, ceased to be the Royal Confessors, willingly entered into the conspiracy *.

The Conspirators engaged the Marchioness DONNA ELEONORA OF TAVORA, the Duke's sister-in-law, in their scheme. The haughty spirit and unbounded ambition of that lady had been wounded by the title of Duke having been refused to THE MARQUIS OF TAVORA, her husband; and her talent at intrigue soon engaged her whole family in the design. Her husband, her two sons, her two daughters and their husbands, her two brothers-in-law, and their more confidential attendants, became the depositaries of this secret.

These persons, like others who have meditated similar crimes, sought encouragement from Casuists and Confessors,

* The disgrace of the Jesuits at the Court of Lisbon, was chiefly referable to the following circumstance. They were, as is well known, in effect the real Sovereigns of Paraguay, while the King of Spain was the nominal Ruler: the Court of Spain had, by a treaty of exchange, ceded certain districts in Paraguay to Joseph the King of Portugal, who was of the House of Braganza. The Jesuits were accused of having opposed themselves to this arrangement, and of having incited the population, which was destined to fall under the dominion of Portugal, to resist the transfer in question. This cause of complaint, in addition to many others, had occasioned the loss of the Jesuits' credit at the Court of Portugal.

and found them in three Jesuits named MALAGRIDA, ALEXANDER, and MATHOS, who decided that to kill a King, was only a *venial* sin, and not a *mortal* one: a circumstance, which supplies another example of the abuse of Auricular Confession, and the influence of the Catholic Priesthood.

The Conspirators, fortified by such councils, and provided with their pardons for the other world, awaited a favorable opportunity for accomplishing their purpose: this occurred on the night of the 3d of September, 1758, when, as THE KING OF PORTUGAL was returning from his country residence at Bellem, three of the principal Conspirators, who were on horseback, fired their guns twice into the coach, but fortunately only succeeded in wounding the Monarch: a discovery ensued.

Some imprudent conduct of the DUKE OF AVEIRO led to his detection: he was seized with his accomplices, and on the 13th of January, 1759, the DUKE OF AVEIRO, and the MARQUIS AND MARCHIONESS OF TAVORA, as well as all the other Conspirators (with the exception of the Jesuits), were executed.

An event of this description produced, as might be expected, considerable sensation throughout Europe, more especially as it was immediately followed by the expulsion of the Jesuits from Portugal; as having supplied out of their body, the instigators, or, at all events, the Confessors of the Conspirators.

The three Jesuits, who were more particularly deserving of punishment, escaped death because the King himself could not (consistently with the allegiance he owed to the Sovereign Pontiff) cause an Ecclesiastic to be condemned to death without first obtaining the consent of the Court of Rome! The King tried for above a year to obtain permission from the Pope to put those Jesuits, who were his own subjects, upon their trial, for no less a crime than a conspiracy against his own life; but *he was unable to obtain it!!!* The consequence was, an open rupture between the two Courts, the result of which, it was generally expected, would have been a renuncia-

tion, on the part of Portugal, of a yoke which England had thrown off before: but such event did not take place; the dominion of Rome over that country being too absolute to permit even such a cause of complaint as this to dissolve the connexion between them.

On the death of the King in 1777, THE MARQUIS OF POMBAL lost his influence, and retired to his estate, where he spent the remainder of his life.

The Editors of the *Dictionnaire Historique*, from which part of this account is taken, observe, "The Jesuits who were sent out of Portugal by the MARQUIS DE POMBAL have painted him as a monster, unfit for his office, who injured the state, brought every thing to confusion, and neither paid the army nor knew how to employ it. The opponents of the Jesuits, on the contrary, have represented him in a very different point of view, commending him as a Minister of genius, activity, and vigilance, as the restorer of military discipline, of commerce, and of the marine, all which had been entirely neglected before;" and they then very properly notice the importance of an impartial collection of facts, in order to furnish the means of an equitable decision on this question; and conclude by observing of the Memoirs of the MARQUIS OF POMBAL, which appeared in 1784, and are quoted by MR. DALLAS, that they are destitute of that character of impartiality which appears so peculiarly desirable.—See *Dictionnaire Historique*, Articles D'AVEIRO and POMBAL; and also the ACORDAO, or official Declaration of the Royal Council of Lisbon.

Now (to advert to the observation of the Editors), does MR. DALLAS imagine that he has furnished us with "the means of an equitable decision" in keeping back one of the most important features in the History of POMBAL? Can we suppose him sincere in his wish that MR. CANNING, "that liberal advocate of the Catholic body" (as he calls him), should form a right judgment upon the guilt or innocence of the Jesuits in Portugal, when he withholds from him, and

from others, the main fact in the case? Admitting that MR. DALLAS did not believe that the King of Portugal's life was attempted: admitting that MR. DALLAS did not believe that three such Jesuits as MALAGRIDA, ALEXANDER, and MATHOS, were the Counsellors and Confessors of the Conspirators: admitting that MR. DALLAS did not believe that the Catholic King of Portugal endeavoured, but in vain, to obtain from the Head of the Catholic Church a licence to try his own subjects for an attempt on his own life: admitting that MR. DALLAS did not believe that the whole Society of Jesuits were expelled from the Kingdom of Portugal for the conduct of three of their Order on that particular occasion; yet will MR. DALLAS's disbelief of these several points justify his keeping them all out of sight? MR. DALLAS was under no obligation whatever to have adverted to the History of POMBAL in his Defence of the Jesuits; but if he chose to do so, for the purpose of proving that the Jesuits were the innocent victims of "an "unprincipled and unrelenting Minister," who was "their "enemy," he is bound to give us the whole facts of the case, from which the Public may judge, as well as he, whether POMBAL's hostility did or did not arise from the nefarious conduct of the Jesuits themselves. MR. DALLAS, instead of supplying us with proper means of information, presents us only with an *ex parte* statement to answer his own purpose: and he must, therefore, be informed, that, among honest logicians, the "*suppressio veri*" has been generally placed on a level with the "*suggestio falsi*;" and that a British Public can no more sanction the concealment of known truth, than the assertion of deliberate falsehood.

The erroneous statements respecting POMBAL which occur in MR. DALLAS's fourth Chapter, are succeeded by a philippic against THE MODERN PHILOSOPHERS; which has no other harm in it than that it involves another attempt on the part of MR. DALLAS to connect the existence of their system with the suppression of the Order of Jesuits, and to prove that the Illuminati of the French Revolution attacked the Jesuits because

they were every where the friends of Religion *, the advocates of Loyalty, and the promoters of Education: assertions of this description (for they are nothing else) have been already so fully considered, that it is the less necessary to dwell upon them here. The fact is, that the modern Philosophy was no more at war with the Jesuits than as Jesuitism presented more tangible and palpable matter for ridicule and argument than the milder and less offensive form of Popery, which was exhibited by the Catholic Church at large. In proportion as Jesuitism was the most corrupt modification of a corrupt system, it was only to be expected that Infidelity should have fastened on some of the ranker abuses to which the Order of Jesuits gave a greater prominence than any other Order; but, so far from the *virtues* of the Jesuits having been the occasion of attracting the notice of the Philosophers (as Mr. DALLAS would have us believe), it was their *vices* alone which obtained them this distinction, and helped to furnish the enemies of Religion with the strongest weapons against Religion itself.

So far from the suppression of the Jesuits having given rise to the Infidelity of the Continent, it is a notorious fact, that Infidelity had abounded long before the Suppression of the Jesuits became a question; and it is remarkable that one of the first acts of CLEMENT XIV. on his elevation to the Popedom, was, to dispatch a Brief to LOUIS XV. the sole object of which was to claim his support in opposing the efforts of Infidelity and Irreligion. He observed, that a general conspiracy against Christianity was actually then in motion—had advanced a considerable way, and threatened far

* The obligations which *Religion* was under to the Jesuits may be estimated from the following remark of MONCLAR: "Religion" (says he) "has been demoralized by their pushing it to the contradiction of "its own principles: an alliance of secular policy with certain expressions of devotion has thus, by an alloy of good with evil, formed "pious fanatics, and subtle politicians, who are all strongly united together by a devoted attachment to their Order, and equally inflamed "by a spirit of party, in which some are Agents and others are Instruments."—*Compte Rendu.*

more serious consequences to the world than MR. DALLAS's supposed Conspiracy against the Jesuits: under the strong conviction of impending danger, he called upon the French King to assist him in stemming a torrent which menaced the destruction of whatever had till then been held sacred among men. This Brief was preceded by a Circular Letter to the Clergy of France, having the same object: is it probable—is it possible, that with such views, that very Pope should in a few years after he had dispatched such a Brief and Letter, have issued the Edict for the suppression of the Jesuits, if the ruin of the Church, which he so anxiously desired to save, was likely to have been either occasioned or accelerated by that measure? A more unfortunate anachronism was, perhaps, never committed, than when MR. DALLAS imagined that the Suppression of the Order of Jesuits preceded the appearance of Infidelity; and *ergo*, that the suppression in question produced such Infidelity. MR. DALLAS should at least have endeavoured to be correct in his dates, if not in his facts.

In the same spirit, and with a similar object, we find MR. DALLAS conducting his argument upon THE NECESSITY OF RELIGION IN EDUCATION, from p. 244 to p. 257.

The fallacy apparent throughout this statement is, that MR. DALLAS assumes from the outset, first, that Religion formed the great character of Education among the Jesuits; and, secondly, that all Religious Education ceased with the suppression of the Order.

The answer to these allegations has been already given; but it may be observed further in this place, that the religion of which MR. DALLAS draws so alluring a portrait is not likely to captivate any persons who will only be at the trouble of examining the difference between the Religion of the Reformation, which they themselves profess, and the Religion of Popery, which MR. DALLAS virtually advocates throughout his work: much less will the portrait exhibited by MR. DALLAS be likely to win the affections of such Protestants as consider that the Religion of the Jesuits was decidedly of a lower

standard than that of Popery itself; insomuch that they who were best acquainted with the Romish faith, and most attached to it, not only asserted, for two Centuries, that Jesuitism was something else than Christianity, but abundantly established their position by the best reasoning, and the keenest ridicule. It follows, therefore, that the Religious Education of the Jesuits was not quite so estimable a thing in itself as MR. DALLAS would represent it; and with regard to his declaration, that the destruction of the Jesuits was the destruction of Education in Catholic Countries, it may be observed, that the failure of Education in those Countries can no more be attributed to the suppression of the Order of Jesuits than the failure of Religion can be referred to the same cause. It was, indeed, among the awful consequences of the French Revolution (as MR. BURKE predicted would be the case), that “learning” was “soon trodden under the feet of a swinish multitude;” but to contend, on that account, that the suppression of the Jesuits occasioned the suppression of learning, is no nearer to the truth than to contend that their suppression led to the suppression of Religion itself, of Monarchy, and of established order; all which bowed under the action of a far superior force, and owed their misfortunes to a very different cause. It is, however, the less necessary to enter farther into this question, since it has already been so largely considered.

Some remarks of MR. DALLAS in treating it require, however, a brief attention; namely, those in which he supposes (p. 248), that even in England (although the Jesuits have not been suppressed here) we are also educating our population *without Religion*, as they did in Catholic Countries, in consequence of the suppression of the Jesuits! He affirms on this head, that “there is in this country a system in full operation, and patronized by some of the first characters of the State, by which a very large portion of the people will, in a few years, consist of persons able to read, write, and keep accounts, who will have no knowledge, or an erroneous

“ one, of the Duties and Sanctions of Religion, and whose morality will consequently be dependent upon their reasoning faculties:” and he adds, “ I am very much mistaken if those faculties will not lead to similar conceptions and similar effects as those produced by the reasoning faculties of 1788 and 1789.”

In this prognostication we have MR. DALLAS’s fears upon the absence of Religion in the Education of the English poor, and we find, that although he can view unmoved the certain, and, perhaps, not very distant, consequences of the Establishment of Jesuits in England, he is tremblingly alive to the consequences of our not possessing such a perfect system of *religious* Education as the Jesuits could furnish us with! This sentiment, although not avowed in express terms, is evidently the scope of Mr. DALLAS’s observations respecting the want of Religion in our Education.

With regard to the correctness of his assumption, that “ RELIGION” is thus neglected in the education of our poor, it has no more foundation in fact than the many other erroneous assertions which have been already disposed of. In such of our Schools as are connected with the Establishment (and these are now spread over the whole kingdom), an avowed and marked attention is paid to the inculcation of religious and moral principles: in by far the greater number of those Schools which are conducted by Dissenters from the Establishment, no less attention is paid to the formation of religious and moral sentiments; and even in those Schools (comparatively few, indeed), which are conducted by particular classes of Dissenters, who are, perhaps, less attentive to any precise formulary in their mode of worship, still Religion is by no means forgotten; nor, perhaps, is there a single School (*except those of the Catholics*), whether under the government of Churchmen or Dissenters, in which the *SCRIPTURES* are omitted to be used by every class *.

* It is a fact which cannot be controverted, that both in Ireland and England the Holy Scriptures are *wholly* excluded by the Catholic

Now, while this is the case, no man has a right to complain that “*Religion*” is left out of Education—although, perhaps, the whole of that Education may not be conducted

Priests from every school where they have any control over the system of education. The Reports of the Hibernian Society demonstrate, that some of the Irish Bishops have traversed their dioceses, on purpose to denounce those schools as “*nefarious, and abominable*,” where “*spelling-books and the Scriptures alone were taught*.” The following copy of an Affidavit will illustrate this remark :

“ County of Sligo, to wit.—JOHN CAVANAUGH and MARTIN GORDON, both of the parish of Killglass, in the barony of Tyreragh and county of Sligo, for the Hibernian Society Schools (teachers), came before me this day, and voluntarily made oath on the Holy Evangelists; and said, that on Sunday, the 31st of March last, the Rev. Dominick Bellew, Titular Bishop of Killala, came to the chapel of the said parish of Killglass, accompanied by the Rev. James Haran, parish Priest of Castle-connor; and that the said Haran said, that the Societies’ Schools were poisonous and pernicious baits, thrown out in order to seduce the children, and to take them from the paths of Heaven to the eternal pains of Hell: that on the said day, the above Bishop, in the said chapel, said, that if he (the said Bishop) had any of the Societies’ books, he would tear them and trample them under his feet: for he would suffer *but a few to READ HIS OWN BIBLE, and much less the PROTESTANT BIBLE, because it leads them into a thousand errors*. He (the said Bishop) asked William Atkinson and John Hart, both teachers in said parish, if they quitted teaching those schools? They said they did quit, upon the prohibition of the said Haran. And (the Deponents) could say much more: but the above are the heads of their depositions, in consequence of which Deponents lost their schools.

“ Sworn before me, this 11th }
“ day of April, 1811. } ROBERT HILLAS.

“ JOHN CAVANAUGH and MARTIN GORDON.”

Abundant evidence is accumulated on this subject in the late “*Correspondence on the Roman Catholic Bible Society*,” printed for L. B. Seeley, of Fleet Street, 1813; but the exclusion of Scriptural Religion from Popish Seminaries is still further, and more strikingly, shewn in the Annual Reports of the “*Irish Catholic Schools*,” of St. Giles’s, London. See also the “*Regulae Indicis Synodi Tridentinæ*.”

It is a notorious fact, likewise, that the British system of edu-

precisely in the way which he might wish. A member of the Establishment, for instance, might, perhaps, desire that the Church Catechism should be used by the Dissenter; a Dissenter, on the contrary, might prefer the Assembly's Catechism; and some classes of Dissenters might reject them both; but still, so long as the BIBLE is used in all, the patrons of the Jesuits, and the admirers of their system of Education, have no right to assert that Religion is neglected in educating our population. The Jesuits, whatever they might place in the hands of the Poor, would assuredly deny them the Bible, as most at war with their whole system of darkness and error: it is a book which they can never love, since it testifies of them that their deeds are evil; nor can they ever permit it to be read or studied by the mass of the population: their Defenders love it no better, and can as little endure the thought of its being placed in the hands of the Poor, or generally circulated throughout the country; hence MR. DALLAS says (and it is to be hoped that this avowal will not be lost upon Englishmen and Protestants), "Nor without previous oral instruction should *the Bible itself be put into the hands of readers, whether children or ignorant adults.* BIBLE SOCIETIES, consisting, beyond all doubt, of pious men, will diffuse good or evil over the world, according to the prudence with which the Sacred Volumes are distributed."

All this reasoning is in strict conformity with the views of the Holy Roman Church, which, from the beginning of her Secular history, PROHIBITED THE BIBLE, AND PERSECUTED ITS ADMIRERS; nor are the views which were formerly entertained by the members of that Church, as to the danger of the

cation, lately introduced in France, has excited the jealousy of the Catholic Clergy; and at their instigation the King has publicly decreed, "that the Catholic, Apostolical, and Roman Religion should be taught in the new Schools, TO THE EXCLUSION OF EVERY OTHER."—See the Decree recently quoted, and the Remarks upon it in the Gentleman's Magazine for April, 1816, p. 363.

Bible being read by the people, and the consequent duty of withholding it from them, by any means altered. Good Catholic Priests now-a-days have the same dread of the Bible as the Jesuits and their Defenders entertain, and for the same reason *.

* The celebrated Bull “*Unigenitus*,” if no other Papal document existed, would prove the insuperable enmity of the Roman Pontiffs and Prelates to the general use of the Sacred Volume.—The pious Father QUESNEL had exhorted “all sorts of persons to study the Holy Scripture,” and especially “on the Lord’s Day:”—he taught, that “to wrest the New Testament out of the hands of Christians, or to keep it closed up, was to shut the mouth of Christ in respect of them;” and again, said he, “to forbid Christians to read the Holy Scriptures, especially the Gospel, is to forbid the use of light to the children of light, and to make them suffer a sort of excommunication.” Yet, in 1713, not only did Pope CLEMENT XI. but very many Bishops of France, condemn such just sentiments; and they were solemnly denounced, “as false, captious, shocking, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the Church and her practice,” &c.

Even the modern editions of the English New Testament, printed for the use of Roman Catholics themselves, and translated by one of their own Prelates too (in England as well as Ireland), have an “*ADMONITION*” prefixed to them; *the design of which is, to prevent the free and unbiassed perusal of their own authorized version*:—for, say they, in their Admonition, “It was judged necessary to forbid the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar languages, without the advice and permission of the Pastors and spiritual Guides, whom God has appointed to govern his Church.”—“Nor is this due submission to the Catholic Church to be understood of the ignorant and unlearned only, but also of men accomplished in all kind of learning.” Such cautious policy agrees with the express injunctions of the *Rules of the Index*, published by order of the Council of Trent: but it does not quite come up to the standard of a former synod (held at Toulouse in 1229), which absolutely forbade *all* the Laity to possess *any books* either of the Old or the New Testament, in their own tongue,—“*Ne praemissos libros habeant in vulgari translatos, arctissime inhibemus.*”—See p. 82 of the *Correspondence on the Roman Catholic Bible Society*.

Let it never be forgotten, that a great object of the Reformation was to secure to the world the free possession and circulation of the sacred volume; while it has been the invariable object of the Church of Rome

One of these reasoners says, in the Orthodox Journal for April, 1814 (p. 140), "We of the old school shall continue " to think as the whole body of Christians thought for fifteen " hundred years, and as *nine out of ten in that body still* " *think*, that, as Christianity was first taught and established " before that part of the Bible which contains the distinguishing " doctrines of its divine Founder was ever written, *so it* " *might have been propagated and continued to the end of the* " *world, had the Bible never even made its appearance among* " *Christians.*"

But lest there should be any doubt upon this subject, let us hear BISHOP MILNER himself, who, in his Pastoral Charge to his Clergy, dated 30th March, 1813, observes as follows: " Of late years, you know that numerous Societies have been " formed, and incredible sums of money raised, throughout " the United Kingdom, among Christians of other communions, for the purpose of distributing Bibles gratis to all " poor people who are willing to accept of them. In acting " thus, they act conformably to the fundamental principles of " THEIR religion, which teach that the Bible contains all things " necessary for salvation, and that it is easy to be understood by " every person of common sense. But who could have imagined that Catholics, grounded upon quite opposite principles, " should nevertheless shew a disposition to follow the example " of Protestants in this particular, by forming themselves " also into *Bible Societies*, and contributing their money for " putting the mysterious letter of God's word into the hands " of the illiterate poor, instead of educating Clergymen even " in the present distressing scarcity of Clergy to expound the " sense of that word to them?" The Bishop then proceeds to make some observations upon what he calls "*the prevailing*

to prohibit and restrict both the one and the other, so that the "*PRUDENCE*" recommended by MR. DALLAS, in distributing the Bible, accords well with the system of Jesuitism and of Popery.

“ *Biblio-mania*,” which, he says, he hopes his Clergy “ will not fail to impress upon the minds of their people.”

The first remark is, that “ when our Saviour Christ sent his Apostles to convert the world, he did not say to them, “ Go and distribute volumes of the Scripture among the nations of the world ; but, Go into the whole world, and PREACH the Gospel to every creature.

“ 2d. It is notorious that not one of the nations converted by the Apostles or their successors, nor any part of a nation, was converted by reading the Scriptures. No : they were converted in the way appointed by Christ, that of preaching the Gospel, as is seen in the Acts of the Apostles, Bede’s History, &c.

“ 3d. *The promiscuous reading of the Bible is not calculated, nor intended, by God, as the means of conveying religious instruction to the bulk of mankind* : for the bulk of mankind cannot read at all ; and we do not find any divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters.”

This Prelate then proceeds to object against the distribution of the Bible, on account of its obscurity, &c. and says, “ In a word, it is evidently a much more rational plan to put the Statutes at Large into the hands of the illiterate vulgar, telling them to become their own Lawyers, than it is to put the text itself of the mysterious Bible into their hands, for enabling them to hammer their religion and morality out of it.”

After some observations upon the obligation of the Catholic Clergy to study the Bible, he says, “ The Church moreover recommends the reading of it to all persons who have some tincture of learning, and an adequate knowledge of their religion, together with the necessary humility and docility to dispose them (in common with her first Pastors and the Pope himself) to submit their own private opinion upon all articles of faith, to the belief of the great Church of all nations and all ages.” — “ In conclusion, then”

(says the Bishop), “ my dear and beloved brethren, *I am* “ *confident you will not encourage or countenance the distribution of Bibles or Testaments, among the very illiterate persons of your respective congregations, as proper introductory books of instruction for them.*”

The above Charge is signed by JOHN MILNER, Bishop of Castabala, Vicar Apostolic.

The same Prelate, in the Orthodox Journal for October, 1813, a work which he supports with all his authority, still farther develops his views upon the danger of the Bible, and the heterodoxy of the Bible Societies, in the following terms :

“ *To the Editor of the Orthodox Journal.*

“ **SIR,**

“ In my communications to you last month, upon “ Bible Societies, and the use of the Holy Scriptures, I stated “ that one of the avowed objects of Protestants, in the institution of these Societies, is to undermine the Catholic rule of “ faith, and to establish their own, as laid down in the Sixth “ of the Thirty-nine Articles *, and of course to affect the “ downfall of the Papal power, as the Rev. T. Cotterel declares “ in his sermon to one of these Societies, preached on the third “ of last June. Hence, as I observed, we can account for the “ special eagerness of these Associations to spread their Bibles “ among the Catholics of Ireland ; one Society alone having “ boasted of the distribution of 60,000 Bibles in that Island, “ during the course of a single twelvemonth. I described a “ *Catholic Bible Society* as a novel and portentous Institution ; “ unknown to the Fathers and Doctors† of past ages ; at “ variance with the third rule, concerning the use of Holy

* This Article is as follows : “ Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation ; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.”

† “ Unde Doctoris titulo gloriantur, nisi ut doceant ?” Erasmus to the Cardinal of Louvain.

“ Scripture, laid down by a Committee of the Council of Trent; giving into the policy of Protestants, and of course injurious to the religion of Catholics, as also to the authority of their Pastors; it being the exclusive business of the latter to instruct all ranks of people by expounding to them *viva voce*, both Scripture and Tradition.”

After attacking the intended plan of a Roman Catholic Bible Society, and commenting upon a design of publishing the Bible, with the notes of a Prelate of that Church, he observes: “ The Tridentine Fathers make no distinction between Bibles in the vulgar tongue, *with notes*, and those *without notes*; and it is evidently IMPOSSIBLE TO ADD ANY NOTES WHATEVER TO THE SACRED TEXT, WHICH WILL MAKE IT A SAFE AND PROPER ELEMENTARY BOOK OF INSTRUCTION FOR THE ILLITERATE POOR.”

Again, observing farther upon the scheme of a Catholic Bible Society, he says: “ The Catholic Pastors can instruct, and do instruct their people, at the present day, in the manner they have instructed them, in all days since those of Christ, much better than these lay Evangelists can teach them, with the help of Bibles, though they stereotyped all the linen in Ireland into Bibles; and the labouring poor of Ireland, *without a single Bible in a village*, know more of the revealed truths of the Gospel, and can give a more rational as well as a more detailed account of them, than the same class of people can in this country, which the Bibliomanists boastingly call THE LAND OF BIBLES.”

“ I am, &c.

“ Wolverhampton,

“ J. MILNER, D. D.

“ Oct. 16, 1813.”

We thus clearly find that a modern Bishop of the Romish Church, and Vicar Apostolic in England, who is esteemed a pillar of orthodoxy, cannot endure the distribution of the Bible; that he combats the grand Article of the Church of England, which asserts that “ the Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation;” that he condemns those *of his own*

Church who join even a *Catholic* Bible Society, and requires them to *oppose* such a project in their respective districts—that he regards the Bible as an obscure and mysterious Book, which can no more be understood by the vulgar than the *Statutes at large*; and, therefore, should only be read by the learned, or by those who will submit their own opinion, upon articles of faith, to the judgment of the Holy Roman Church. We find from his statement, that the Church of Rome thinks no better now of the sixth Article of the Church of England, than she did in **LUTHER**'s day, and no better of the Heretics who receive it; and finally, that whether the Bible is published with notes, or without, it must still continue both an unsafe and improper book for the illiterate poor. We also find from the other learned correspondent of the *Orthodox Journal*, that “ nine “ out of ten of the Catholic body think that Christianity “ might have been propagated and continued, if there never “ had been such a book as the Bible in the world !”

The whole of the above reasoning sufficiently refutes itself, and has been only adduced for the purpose of shewing that a modern Defender of the *Jesuits*, in opposing the Bible Society, speaks the same language, and entertains the same alarms on the subject of the dispersion of the Bible over the united Kingdom, as the ancient and modern Church of Rome; and yet this is the writer who complains that Religion is neglected in the education of the people ! Assuredly such a Religion as he would recommend, namely, a Religion which prefers Tradition to Inspiration, which can contrive to do without the Bible, and which, with power in its hands, would probably annihilate every Bible Society in the kingdom; such a Religion as this, undoubtedly, is at present neglected in the Education of the people of this country, and long may it continue to be * !!!

* No one has more forcibly inculcated the danger of putting the *Scriptures* into the hands of the People, than the sagacious and amiable **FENELON**, in his Letter to the *Archbishop of Arras*; which may serve to

MR. DALLAS, it appears, sees no harm in extending the tenets of Popery by countenancing "*Catholic Schools*" in a Protestant country. It is sufficiently well known that not only Jesuits, but every other denomination of Roman Catholics, exclude the Bible from Schools "superintended by zealous Priests," such as MR. DALLAS mentions; and yet MR. DALLAS affirms that "all such Establishments merit encouragement, not only from members of their own communion, but from all, who by influence or wealth are able to aid them," p. 254. He is therefore not unwilling to give every possible countenance to Popish Schools, wherein the Holy Scriptures are studiously kept out of sight, and yet he is extremely apprehensive lest Protestants should be too active and too imprudent in circulating the sacred volume, whether among children or adults.

If it were possible to doubt whether modern Roman Catholics, and even those who reside in the metropolis itself, under the jurisdiction and guidance of BISHOP POYNTER (the Vicar Apostolic), do, at the present time, inculcate these sentiments of MR. DALLAS, we need only refer to a "*Correspondence*" lately published "*on the Roman Catholic Bible Society*," and sold by *Hatchard*; which proves, beyond all controversy, the insuperable objections *now entertained* by the most liberal-minded Romanists in this kingdom to the free use of the Bible, *even in their own version of Rheims and Douay!* The truth is, that MR. GANDOLPHY, a Priest of the Spanish Chapel, near Manchester Square, threw out a challenge to the Bible Societies to publish "*a Catholic Version without Notes*," and promised, in the name of his Brethren, to accept and distribute it with gratitude. But the above-mentioned "*Correspondence*" proves, that no such willingness or intention in fact existed: for, when certain individuals proposed to give their

shew, that, however respectable an individual of the Catholic communion is personally, he will be straitened by his own system, and must necessarily be influenced by its great and fatal errors.

own Catholic version to the poor, the English Catholic Board took the alarm, and the Clergy resisted this benevolent design with all their power.

So lately as the month of February, 1816, the Committee of St. Patrick's Schools in London have been extensively issuing a string of Resolutions, the main purpose of which is to prevent the poor Irish in St. Giles's from reading the English Bible at another Charity School!—See First Report of the Irish Catholic Schools, Second Edition, 1816.

In MR. DALLAS's further observations upon the evils likely to arise from Bible Societies, he appears to consider the knowledge of Astronomy necessary before persons can understand the Scriptures.—“*In Theology*” (says he, p. 252.) “as in natural Philosophy, the uninformed mind cannot of itself embrace even the most incontrovertible truths: the raising of the dead, and the rotation of the earth, are alike incomprehensible; what is not immediately intelligible is not impressive; but when once we have been taught to observe the motion of the heavenly bodies, and are made sensible that the power which would assign certainty of operation to Nature, must be equal to the suspension of it, *Astronomy and Religion* open upon us, and we *fly to Newton and the Testament*; and seeing truths unfold themselves, we willingly take much on trust in both; certain that books where we find so many demonstrations, are not intended to deceive us in any one point, and the resurrection of our Saviour becomes sooner solved than the precession of the equinox.”

Now, although no one would reject, or think meanly of the collateral evidence to the truth of Revelation which natural Philosophy affords, it is worse than idle to suppose, as is done throughout the above passage, that, in order to understand the Bible, men must be more or less natural Philosophers. Does MR. DALLAS require to be informed, that many of those persons who have most firmly believed in Revelation, and have most faithfully adhered to its precepts, have been at the same time among the most illiterate of mankind, and that multi-

tudes have been ornaments of the Christian faith through life, and have derived their whole consolation from it in death, who knew nothing about Newton's Principia, or Locke on the human Understanding; while perhaps others who have even edited Newton (as the Jesuits did) have been utter fools in spiritual things, and worse than children in their estimate of the distinction between right and wrong? If MR. DALLAS admits that great learning may exist, where true wisdom never had a place; and if he allows the possibility of measuring the stars, and being at the same time ignorant of God, to what purpose is the exaltation of human science as so indispensable a thing in the attainment of piety? and what necessary connexion does he discover between the sublimest mysteries of Revelation, and "the precession of the equinox?"

The Popish Court of the Inquisition condemned the Astronomer GALILEO to perpetual imprisonment as a Heretic, for having discovered and published incontestable proofs of the motion of the Earth! MR. DALLAS will not deny that the Inquisition has been in all ages the great engine employed by Papal Rome, for establishing and perpetuating her own empire of darkness and cruelty: how then can he contend in the face of such a fact as this, that science, in general, has derived any aid from Popery, or that Popery has shewn any attachment to Astronomy in particular?

In concluding his remarks on a Religious Education, MR. DALLAS has manufactured a most elaborate eulogium upon DR. BELL, for his system of education; and Dr. Bell will no doubt feel himself highly honoured by the company in which he is placed, and for being permitted to share in the compliments which MR. DALLAS has at the same time bestowed on the Jesuits, for what he calls "their admirable system of Education."

MR. DALLAS, in concluding his Book, takes credit for "the sentiments of *loyalty* and of *religion* which" (he says) "have in such a work fallen from his pen:" but it will probably require a more microscopic attention on the part of the critics,

than even *they* are in the habit of bestowing, to discover any peculiar instances of such sentiments, especially of the former; while less learned readers will certainly feel some doubts how far the defender of the Disloyal, can have advanced the cause of Loyalty, or how far the advocate of the Irreligious can have promoted the interests of Religion. Until that sort of attachment which the Jesuits have ever evinced for Monarchy and Laws, can justly be denominated *Loyalty*, and that kind of Religion which they have professed can properly be called *the Religion of the Gospel*, we may fairly be permitted to entertain some doubts upon the validity of the claims to Loyalty and Religion, which have been advanced by their Patron and Admirer.

MR. DALLAS, in his last paragraph, remarks farther upon "the new Conspiracy" (as he terms it) formed against the Jesuits, which he characterizes as "possessing all the malignity, if not all the talent or power of the old one." How far the evidence adduced by MR. DALLAS, as to the existence either of an old or a new Conspiracy (properly so called) against the Jesuits, has established his assertions to that effect, may be safely left to the judgment of the public. That in every period of their history, the Jesuits have incessantly attracted the opposition of their own Church, of Sovereign Princes, of Parliaments, Universities, regular Governments, public Societies, and private Individuals, will be readily admitted; but MR. DALLAS, in choosing to state this point abstractedly from the fact of their having drawn down such opposition on their own heads, by their own conduct, determines only to give one view of a question, and to suppress the other: and as to his designating this opposition by the invidious name of a CONSPIRACY, it is about as just and correct an account of the matter, as if a Defender of depredators and marauders were also to entitle the opposition, which all honest men are agreed in giving to the schemes of such men, "A CONSPIRACY."

With regard to the character of "malignity" which he imputes to the new Conspirators, it may be asked, how motives

of this description can with any honesty or decency be attributed to such persons, whether in or out of Parliament, as have endeavoured to inform the public upon this great question? The evident impropriety of such imputations, as applicable to a member of the Legislature, has induced him to except SIR JOHN HIPPISLEY from such a charge, and not to insert his name in the Bill of Indictment for *a Conspiracy* which he has, with so much gravity, preferred against others; and this, notwithstanding his former observations upon SIR JOHN's attack of the Jesuits.

The Conspirators consist (says MR. DALLAS) of "men " who have dared to warn the Clergy against instituting " schools for instructing Children in the national religion, of " Jacobinical Philosophers, materialists, votaries of reason " and eternal sleep, and perhaps some Catholic Clergy, whose " interest may be affected!"

After this *Catalogue raisonnée* of the Conspirators against the Jesuits, MR. DALLAS at length sums up by observing, that he " trusts he has proved enough to convince his readers " that *the Jesuits have been calumniated*, that their destruction was effected by *the malice and envy of their Enemies*, " on the one hand, and by the pusillanimity of their proper " Protector" (Pope Clement XIV.) " on the other; that as " far as authority extends, there is *a great and brilliant* " *balance in their favor*; that on the ground of reasoning, " the proof of their *virtue, as well as of their religion*, does " *not fall short of demonstration in the account of their* " *Institute*; that they are *not at war with Protestant* " *Governments, whose Catholic subjects they are well known long* " *to have trained up in loyalty*; and that *the small number* " *now in this country, have completed those proofs of loyalty,* " *by a solemn oath of allegiance to the King:*" while the simple fact is (as has been before observed), that they have taken no oath whatever to this effect, but one directly opposed to it!!!

Such is the summary, finally drawn up by MR. DALLAS.

It is the object of the preceding REPLY, and of the following HISTORY, to shew upon what an unsound foundation such assertions rest.

The same observation will apply to the string of assertions, contained in the Letters which appeared in the Pilot Newspaper, and the Orthodox Journal, which MR. DALLAS has reprinted in his Book. In considering the gall which the writer of those Letters has mixed with his ink (to advert to a remark of BURNET upon SIR THOMAS MORE), one is strongly reminded of HOOKER's observation: "To your railing I say "nothing; to your reasons I say as follows."—To the scurillous and offensive language of those Letters, no person can be expected to give any answer; but to such reasoning as they contain, it is presumed that the Reply to MR. DALLAS and THE HISTORY which follows, will be found to afford no unsatisfactory refutation.

It only remains to observe, that the task of examining his Defence of the Jesuits is now brought to a close. That task was begun under a conviction that if a man, possessing only a single talent, is likely, by producing it, to assist in supporting the cause of truth, and detecting the obliquities of error, he would not be justified in hiding that single talent in a napkin: this task has been conducted with some degree of labour, amidst many interruptions, and with no ordinary consumption of time: it is now presented to the Public, in the humble hope that some advantages may result from it. At all events, its Author will have the satisfaction of knowing, that if, at any future period, this Protestant, happy, and envied nation shall be found to have surrendered some of her best privileges and safeguards either in favor of the Jesuits, or those of their communion; so fatal an act of political suicide will not have been committed without previous warning of the consequences, nor without the production of those salutary cautions which are supplied by the light of history, and the evidence of experience. It will be easy to undervalue the motives by which he has been actuated in calling upon his countrymen, to con-

sider the peculiar dangers of the present crisis, and the probable consequences of the revival of the Order of Jesuits and their unobstructed establishment in the heart of our own Empire. It will be easy to shew that what has been so inadequately performed by the Author, might have been executed with far greater ability by others; but one consolation no man taketh from him —the consciousness of Integrity. It is the simple desire of benefiting his beloved country, which has been his ruling motive throughout this work; and whatever may be the reception which his attempt may experience in the world, he dares at all events to make his appeal to a higher tribunal, for the purity of his intentions and the simplicity of his object.

A

HISTORY OF THE JESUITS.

CHAP. I.

ORIGIN OF THE JESUITS.

IT has been observed, with truth, that as the constant purpose of God is to extract good from evil, and to overrule, for the best ends, the malevolent or mistaken designs of man ; so the general aim of man, when not acting under the influence of divine illumination, is to bring evil out of good, and to convert those appointments which were designed for the advantage and happiness of the world, into so many occasions of misery and mischief to himself and others.

Of the truth of this position, the early History of the Jesuits affords a remarkable example.

THE REFORMATION OF RELIGION was an event which promised incalculable benefit to mankind : like the faith which it professed to purify, it had “ the promise of the life that now “ is, and of that which is to come : ” in proportion as it elevated the spiritual condition of man, it raised him in the scale of sentient beings, and advanced his temporal interests : while it opened to him prospects full of immortality in a future state of being, it decidedly meliorated his lot in the present period of existence—it at once delivered his soul from the ignominious bondage of sin, in which a religion of forms had enthralled it, and, at the same time, rescued his mind from the shackles of an usurped dominion : while it secured the free agency, and promoted the real interests of the immortal spirit, it placed a guard at the same time about the person of its

possessor ; restrained the incursions of arbitrary power ; resisted tyranny in every form ; and fostered civil liberty, without encouraging licentiousness. The worship of God was thus purified of its dross, and purged of its secularities ; and the throne of monarchs was placed on its only secure foundation—the affections of the people ; while those affections were perpetually fed and nourished by a grateful sense of the religious and temporal privileges which can only be enjoyed or appreciated under such a state of things.

No sooner, however, had THE REFORMATION, which was fraught with such blessings for mankind, appeared in the world, than it became the main object of all who “ loved “ darkness rather than light,” to oppose and overthrow it ; in other words, to bring all the evil in their power out of the elements of so much good : and, as if in direct contradiction to the fable of the monarch who converted every thing he touched into gold, the undeviating policy of such persons appeared to be to extend and perpetuate the counterfeit currency of the Romish corruptions, and to deprecate and destroy whatever bore the stamp and impress of Heaven.

In order to this, they selected Instruments the best adapted to their purpose ; for, of all the enemies of THE REFORMATION, the most subtle, the most powerful, and the most implacable were THE JESUITS.

Raised up for the specific purpose of obstructing the march of a purer system, and of opposing, with all their power, the diffusion of spiritual light, and the progress of civil liberty ; these mighty advocates of the Papal and Ecclesiastical dynasty did not, in any measure, disappoint the hopes which were formed of them from the beginning ; but fulfilled, in every particular, their high destiny, and were only not successful in utterly extinguishing the light of truth throughout the world, because they entered the lists against the Most High, and sought, under the guise of Religion, to compass the most nefarious ends by the employment of the most unhallowed means.

That the great object of the institution of the Jesuits in the first instance, was the overthrow of THE REFORMATION, will appear from every Author who has adverted to their early history. The following Extract from VILLERS will set this matter in its true light :

“ The Sixteenth Century saw LUTHER and LOYOLA arise “ almost at the same moment; the one in the North, the other “ in the South of Europe: the latter, a Spaniard, appeared to “ be a natural product of the soil and spirit of the country “ where he was reared. A century earlier, he would probably “ have only founded an Order, like so many others, a frater- “ nity of worshippers of the Virgin, to whom his devotion “ was particularly addressed: the religious innovations, how- “ ever, which then threatened the existence of the Romish “ Church, gave to the enthusiasm of the pious and warlike “ IGNATIUS another direction. He conceived the idea of a “ sort of spiritual crusade against Heresy. His scheme was “ eagerly adopted at Rome after some hesitation; and the “ design was seriously formed of converting the new Society “ into a formidable phalanx which might be employed against “ the boldest champions of the Reformation.

“ To the reaction, therefore, excited by that event, may be “ ascribed the origin of the Society of Jesus. It will prob- “ ably be satisfactory to read the words of DAMIANUS, one “ of the first Historians of the Order, who thus expresses “ himself in his *Synopsis Historiae Soc. Jesu—primo seculo*, “ printed in 1640 *.

* “ Eodem anno vigesimo-primo, adulta jam nequitia, palam Ec- “ clesiæ bellum indixit LUTHERUS: Iæsus in Pampelonensi arce IGNA- “ TIUS alius ex vulnere fortiorque quasi defendendæ religionis signum “ sustulit.

“ LUTHERUS Petri sedem probris convitiisque lacessere aggreditur: “ IGNATIUS, quasi ad suscipiendam causam à S. Petro prodigiose “ curatur.

“ LUTHERUS irâ, ambitione, libidine victus, à religiosa vita descri- “ scit: IGNATIUS, Deo vocante, impigre obsecutus, à profana ad reli- “ giosam transit.

“ In the same year 1521, LUTHER, with consummate wickedness, openly declared war against the Church:—“ wounded in the fortress of Pampeluna, renovated and strengthened by his accident, IGNATIUS raised the standard in defence of religion.

“ LUTHER attacks the chair of St. Peter with abuse and blasphemy: IGNATIUS is miraculously cured by St. Peter, in order to become his defender.

“ LUTHER, tempted by rage, ambition, and lust, abandons the religious life: IGNATIUS, eagerly obeying the call of God, quits the profane for the religious life.

“ LUTHER, with the guilt of sacrilege, contracts an incestuous marriage, with a virgin of the Lord: IGNATIUS binds himself in the vow of perpetual continence.

“ LUTHER despises all authority of superiors: the first precepts of IGNATIUS, full of Christian humility, are to submit and obey.

“ *LUTHERUS cum sacra Deo virgine incestas nuptias init sacrilegus: perpetuæ continentiaæ voto se adstringit IGNATIUS.*

“ *LUTHERUS omnem superiorum contemnit autoritatem: prima IGNATII monita sunt, plena Christianæ demissionis, subesse et parere.*

“ *In sedem apostolicam, furentis in morem, declamat LUTHERUS: illam ubique tuetur IGNATIUS.*

“ *Ab ea quotquot potest LUTHERUS avertit: quotquot potest conciliat, reducitque IGNATIUS.*

“ *Adversus illam nitentur omnia LUTHERI studia atque conatus: IGNATIUS suos, suorumque labores peculiari voto illi consecrat.*

“ *LUTHERUS sacris Ecclesiæ ritibus venerationem, cultumque detraxit: IGNATIUS omnem illis reverentiam asserit.*

“ *Missæque sacrificio, Eucharistiaæ, Deiparæ, Tutelaribus divis, et illis, tanto LUTHERI furore impugnatis, Pontificum indulgentiis: in quibus novo semper invento celebrandis IGNATII sociorumque dedudat industria.*

“ *LUTHERO illo Germaniæ probro, Epicuri porco, Europæ exitio, orbis infelici portento, Dei atque hominum odio, etc.—æterno consilio Deus opposuit IGNATIUM.”—Synopsis, etc. Lib. I. Diss. VI.*

“ LUTHER, like a madman, declaims against the Apostolic See: IGNATIUS every where undertakes its defence.

“ LUTHER withdraws from it as many as he can: as many as he can, IGNATIUS reconciles, and restores to it.

“ All the devices and efforts of LUTHER are directed against it: IGNATIUS consecrates to it, by a special vow, all his own labours, and all those of his companions.

“ LUTHER has stripped the sacred rites of the Church of all their venerable solemnity: IGNATIUS studies to procure them reverence.

“ The sacrifice of the Mass, the Eucharist, the Virgin Mother of God, the Guardian Angels, and the Indulgences of Popes, which LUTHER attacks with so much fury, are the objects which IGNATIUS and his companions exert themselves continually, to celebrate by new inventions and indefatigable industry.

“ To LUTHER, that disgrace of Germany, that Epicurean Swine, that Curse of Europe, that Monster destructive to the whole earth, hateful to God and man, &c. God by his eternal decree has opposed IGNATIUS.

“ In truth, the new Society acquitted itself faithfully in the new service to which it was destined from its origin.

“ A great number of Catholic Associations and Fraternities, to which the general movement of the human mind gave rise at that period, appeared and eclipsed one another without glory—like those meteors which shine for a short time in the atmosphere, and leave no trace behind them.

“ The Society of Jesus, however, rose above the horizon, like an awful comet, which scatters terror among the nations. While it was scarcely yet established, it rendered important service to the Holy See, during the sitting of the Council of Trent, and powerfully influenced the Decrees of that Assembly. The ancient Orders, especially the Mendicant, conceived great envy against those new-comers, who set out with so much celebrity, and attracted all consideration, and all favors. This emulation redoubled the activity of all such

"as were not Jesuits, and in particular of the Dominicans, who
 "wielded in a more terrible manner than ever the sword of
 "the Inquisition, intrusted to their hands. The Jesuits,
 "however, outstripped all their rivals, acquired the unlimited
 "favor of the Pontiffs, and an immense power through the
 "whole Catholic world. To them, and to the Popes, Mis-
 "sions were the same as colonies to Political Governments, a
 "source of wealth and power*."

With the above account of VILLERS, agrees the statement of HUME:

"The Order of Jesuits" (says he) "was erected when the
 "Court of Rome perceived that the lazy Monks, and Mendic-
 "ant Friars, who sufficed in times of ignorance, were no
 "longer able to defend the ramparts of the Church, assailed
 "on every side; and that the inquisitive spirit of the age re-
 "quired a Society more active and more learned to oppose its
 "dangerous progress †."

The Jesuits had no sooner appeared than they overran the universe with surprising rapidity: they became the Instructors of Youth; the Masters of Seminaries; the Confessors of Kings; the distributors of favors; and the nominators to every office, civil and ecclesiastical, and sometimes even to crowns; in a word, the arbiters of every great event: they acquired immense wealth in freehold estates, and in the benefices which they procured for their houses: they formed the most substantial and brilliant establishments; and laid the foundations of a monarchy, calculated to resist the most powerful princes.

How poor *Mendicants* (for it is thus that these Fathers are designated) could have attained so speedily to an empire of such an extensive and absolute nature, so that they domineered over the properties, the lives, the liberties, and the minds of others, is a prodigy which (said the University of

* See VILLERS's *Essay on the Spirit and Influence of the Reformation of Luther*, translated by MILL, p. 374.

† HUME's *History, Elizabeth, ch. 41. Ann. 1581.*

Paris above a century since) would be regarded by posterity as a fable, if such power should cease to exist *.

The Faculty of Theology in Paris, whose advice the Parliament had sought, pronounced, in 1554, that “*the Society, withdrawn from the obedience and submission due to authorities, unjustly deprived both temporal and spiritual Lords of their rights; brought discord into every form of government, and occasioned among the people many subjects of complaint, many lawsuits, altercations, schisms, and jealousies; that it appeared dangerous to all that concerned the Faith; calculated to disturb the peace of the Church; to overturn the monastic order; and more fit to destroy than to build up.*”

The recital of the crimes committed by the Jesuits, in every part of the world for more than two centuries, will serve to verify this statement. At present it shall suffice to apply to them the powerful language of the first of Roman Orators, reserving the proofs of its application to their Order, to the History which follows:—“*CUM FERRO, CUM METU, CUM PRIVILEGIO, CUM PRÆSENTIBUS COPIIS PERDITORUM, ET MINIS, ET NEFARIO Fœdere, SERVITUTE OPPRESSAM CIVITATEM TENERENT.*”

IGNATIUS LOYOLA, the Patron and Founder of this Society, was born in Spain †. He followed at first the profession of arms. Thrown upon the world by this occupation, he gave himself up to his passions; and the Jesuits who have written his life, observe that vanity and ambition were his ruling pursuits. In 1521, being then 30 years of age, he was at Pampluna when the French besieged it, and had his right leg broken, which was unskilfully treated. During his cure he met with a life of the Saints, written in a romantic style; he read it, and was impressed by it. If we may believe the Je-

* See *Answer of the University, in 1644, to the Apology of the Jesuits*, chap. 27; and *Memorial of the University, presented to the King in 1724*.

† See his life by BAILLET, and in the *Continuation of Fleury*.

suits, he received from Heaven, in the first years of his conversion, miraculous favors, visions, raptures, and ecstasies, from which he appeared to gain extraordinary illumination *. PASQUIER, who witnessed the birth of the Jesuits, was not wrong in calling IGNATIUS one of the most subtle and skilful politicians that his age had produced; and this will plainly appear when the analysis of the government, statutes, and privileges of the Society shall be given. He had such a military genius, that, after his conversion, having had a dispute with a Moor, who maintained that Mary had ceased to be a virgin by becoming a mother, IGNATIUS regretted † that he had suffered this blasphemer to escape, and pursued him in order to kill him: happily, the mule on which he was mounted, took a different road to that of the Moor, and hindered him from executing this pious design.

He soon obtained disciples; but meeting with opposition, he determined to go to Paris. That great city is properly the cradle of the Society. After having experienced various obstacles there, which would have discouraged any other person, he set about forming new disciples; those whom he had had in Spain having deserted him. His first converts were LE FEVRE, who had been his private tutor, and FRANCIS XAVIER, who taught Philosophy in the University; he added to them afterwards LAINEZ, SALMERON, BOBADILLA, and RODRIGUEZ: in order to fix his new disciples irrevocably, he took them, on the day of the Assumption, 1534, to the Church of Montmartre near Paris, where LE FEVRE, who had lately become a Priest, said Mass to them and gave them the Sacrament in the subterraneous chapel. After Mass, the whole seven, with a loud and distinct voice, took a vow to undertake, within a prescribed time, a voyage to Jerusalem, for the conversion of the Infidels; to abandon every thing they possessed in the world, except what they should need for their voyage, and, in

* BAILET, section 6.

† See BAILET on the authority of MAFFEE and BOUHOURS.

case they should be unable to accomplish this, to go and throw themselves at the feet of the Pope, to offer him their services, and to proceed under his orders wherever he might think proper to send them. At length they were joined by three other disciples, namely LE JAY, CODUR, and BROUET. They arrived in Rome in 1538: being assembled at the house of QUIRINO GARZONIO, they agreed * that the Society should be established, as soon as possible, as a religious Society, in order to prevent its being dissolved in future, and to enable it to extend itself in all places, and to subsist to the end of time. In spite of every obstacle which he encountered, he accomplished his object of obtaining the sanction of POPE PAUL III. for his Order †. He had presented the scheme of the Institution to that Pope in 1539, who referred it to three Cardinals for examination.

GUIDICCIIONI ‡, one of the Referees, a man of great merit and learning, strenuously opposed this new Institution; he even wrote a book to establish the reasons of his opposition, and his authority determined the two other Cardinals.

During this examination an event took place, which was the origin of the great credit which the Jesuits afterwards obtained at the Court of Portugal. JOHN III. King of Portugal, wished to send Missionaries into India, and directed his Ambassador at Rome to select ten for the purpose: that Ambassador was MASCARENHAS §, who was closely connected with IGNATIUS, who is even said to have been his Confessor: he then asked him for some of his companions; IGNATIUS gave

* See BAILLET.

† This Pope, after he had founded the Order, struck two medals; one inscribed “*The Gates of Heaven are opened;*” and the other, “*The security of the Roman people.*” How far that event contributed to promote “*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men,*” let the present History shew.

‡ See *Continuation of Fleury*, Vol. xxviii. Lib. 139.

§ See *Continuation of Fleury*, and *Life of Xavier*, by BAILLET.

him RODRIGUEZ and BOBADILLA ; the latter having fallen ill, XAVIER was substituted.

MASCARENHAS carried these two Missionaries with him into Portugal: they departed from Rome, 15th March, 1540, above six months before the approbation of the Institution. RODRIGUEZ remained in Portugal, and XAVIER went to India. IGNATIUS now engaged for unlimited obedience to the Pope; PAUL III. flattered by this promise, began to shew himself more favorable. At length, upon the most urgent solicitations, and upon assurances of the most entire submission, PAUL III. by a Bull of the 27th of September, 1540, confirmed the Institution. Upwards of forty Bulls have followed, in which they have procured exemptions from all jurisdictions, as well ecclesiastical as civil; and from all tithes, and imposts on them and their property.

The Institution is a universal conspiracy against the rights of Bishops, Rectors, Universities, Corporate Bodies, Princes, Magistrates, and every power both spiritual and temporal! the exorbitant privileges with which they have clothed themselves, are only fit to overturn every state, and to spread distress and confusion in all places. It is decided by the Bulls, that the government of the Society is purely monarchical, and it will appear that, from the origin of their establishment, the Jesuits have proposed to swallow up all other Orders, authorities, and possessions; in a word, to concentrate all power in the Society, and to become universal Monarchs.

Every other Establishment has Assemblies, where all which concerns them is decided in Chapters, but in the Houses of the Society nothing is so decided. POPE GREGORY XIV. by his Bull of 1591, declares that IGNATIUS *desired that the form of government in his Society should be MONARCHICAL, and that every thing should be decided by the will of the General alone.* One of the first privileges that IGNATIUS sought from the Pope was, that his disciples should not be com-

elled to take part in the public service of the Church *: in a word, in the privileges obtained by the Jesuits, we observe merely a plan formed with address, and dictated by ambition, not only to establish an absolute monarchy in the Society, but to raise the Society to the monarchy of the whole world, in sub-jecting every other authority to itself.

No sooner had IGNATIUS obtained the approbation of his Institution, than he spread his companions over the whole world. LAINEZ had already penetrated to the Court of the Emperor CHARLES V. †: he was even employed to negotiate the marriage of the daughter of the King of Portugal with PHILIP II. the son of that Emperor, and he accompanied the new Queen into Spain. He thus opened that kingdom to his Society; and it is certain that the Jesuits, having attached themselves to PHILIP II. succeeded at last in obtaining for him the crown of Portugal.

IGNATIUS and his companions had promised the Pope, in their Petitions of 1540 and 1543, to fight under *his* standard; to be *his* soldiers, as they were those of God; and to obey *him* in all things. PAUL III. in consequence, loaded them with favors: he sent LAINEZ, and SALMERON, to the Council of Trent, and LE JAY went there also in the character of Theologian to the Bishop of Augsburgh.

The remarkable protection afforded them by the Pope, and the zeal displayed by them against the Protestants, induced many Princes to admit them into their States, and to assign them establishments.

In 1540, when they presented their petitions to PAUL III. they only appeared in the number of ten. In 1543 they were not more than twenty-four. In 1545 they had only ten Houses: but in 1549 they had two Provinces; one in Spain, and the other in Portugal, and twenty-two Houses: and at

* See Bull of PAUL III. dated 27th of September, 1540: "Teneantur etiam singuli privatim ac particulariter, et non communiter ad dicendum officium."

† See *Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus.*

the death of IGNATIUS in 1556, they had twelve large Provinces. In 1608 RIBADENEIRA reckoned 29 Provinces, and two vice Provinces, 21 Houses of Profession, 293 Colleges, 33 Houses of Probation, 93 other residences, and 10,581 Jesuits. In the Catalogue printed at Rome in 1629 are found 35 Provinces, 2 vice Provinces, 33 Houses of Profession, 578 Colleges, 48 Houses of Probation, 88 Seminaries, 160 Residences, 106 Missions, and, in all, 17,655 Jesuits, of whom 7870 were Priests *. At last (according to the calculation of Father JOUVENCY) they had in 1710, 24 Houses of Profession, 59 Houses of Probation, 340 Residences, 612 Colleges, of which above 80 were in France, 200 Missions, 157 Seminaries and Boarding Houses, and 19,998 Jesuits !

When they thought to establish themselves at Salamanca in 1548 †, MELCHIOR CANO, a Dominican distinguished for his learning and piety, perceived some unfortunate presages which appeared to threaten the Romish Church with the greatest evils, and publicly declared, that he saw in the Society ‡ “ the marks which the Apostle had assigned to the followers of Antichrist ;” and when TURRIAN, one of his friends who had become a Jesuit, besought him to abstain from persecuting the Order, and alledged the approbation which the Holy See had conceded, he only replied, that “ he “ thought himself obliged to warn the people as he did, in “ order that they might not suffer themselves to be seduced.”

The authority of MELCHIOR CANO made a great impression upon the inhabitants of Salamanca : the Jesuits were pointed out and driven away : they would no longer confide to them the education of their youth, nor the instruction of the religious : in a word, the Magistrates, in concert with the University, determined to banish them from the city as a corrupt race §.

* See the *Memorial of the University of Paris* to the King in 1724.

† See *Continuation of Fleury*, Vol. xxix. lib. 145.

‡ See *Morale Pratique*, Vol. i. Preface and first Chapter.

§ See *Histoire des Religieux de la Comp. de Jesus*, l. ii. n. 61.

MELCHIOR CANO, when a Bishop, persisted in the judgment which he had at first pronounced against the Society: indeed, this Prelate, whom THE KING OF PORTUGAL, in his Manifesto of June, 1759, states to have distinguished himself by his science and virtues, expressed himself in these terms in his letter to the Confessor of the EMPEROR CHARLES V.

“ God grant that it may not happen to me as it is fabled
 “ to have happened to Cassandra, whose predictions obtained
 “ no credit until after the capture and burning of Troy. If
 “ the Members of the Society continue as they have begun,
 “ God grant there may not come a time when Kings will wish
 “ to resist them, and will find no means of doing so*.” The
 Jesuits, however, were only then in their infancy.

Among other privileges which PAUL III. granted, was that by which *he exempted the Society and the persons and property of all its members, from every kind of superintendence, jurisdiction, and punishment of Ordinaries: he further prohibited all Archbishops and Bishops, and every other authority, as well ecclesiastical as secular, from obstructing or molesting the companions of Ignatius, their houses, churches, or colleges†.* With such arms as these, nothing could resist them in countries professing a devoted submission to all the Decrees of the Popes.

CHAP. II.

EARLY EFFORTS OF THE JESUITS TO ESTABLISH THEMSELVES IN FRANCE.

FROM the year 1540, immediately after the approval of the Society by PAUL III. IGNATIUS, having dispersed his com-

* See the King of Portugal's *Manifesto*, accompanying his *Circular Letter to the Bishops* in 1759, where he cites this passage.

† See this Bull as given by the Jesuits themselves. They enumerate forty Bulls, but they are in fact much more numerous.

nions in different parts of the world, had sent some Disciples to Paris under the care of EGUILA; and afterwards under that of DOMINIQUE: but the King having ordered all the subjects of CHARLES V. to quit the kingdom, the greater part of this small society, which consisted of the Emperor's subjects, withdrew to Louvain*.

In 1545, however, there were thirteen in the College of the Lombards, either Bursars or Students, and under the guidance of VIOLE, but without being known: they found a powerful protector in GUILLAUME DU PRAT, Bishop of Clermont, natural son of the famous DU PRAT, Chancellor, Cardinal, and Legate, who had offered 120,000 livres for the purchase of the Popedom, and who had left great wealth to his son: this Prelate had first established some Jesuits in his town of Billon; he afterwards lodged those who were in Paris, in his Hotel de Clermont, and left them a considerable legacy.

IGNATIUS had insinuated himself at Rome into the favor of the Cardinal of Lorraine, who promised to protect his Institution at the Court of France, on his return: accordingly, at the instance of this Cardinal, HENRY II. of France issued Letters Patent† in January, 1550, by which he *approved and confirmed* the Bulls obtained by the Jesuits; and *gave them permission to erect, with the funds which might be granted them, a House and College in the City of Paris only, and not in other cities, there to live according to their Rules and Statutes; and commanded his Parliament to sanction such Letters, and permit the Brethren to enjoy the said privileges.*

The Jesuits presented their Letters Patent to the Parliament, which determined that the subject should be referred to the Crown Lawyers for their opinion: M. BRUSLART, the Attorney General, whom PASQUIER and DU BOULAY call the Cato of his age, consulted with his colleagues, M. DE MARIL-

* See *Dupin*, 16 Siècle, part iii. chap. 4.

† See an Extract from them in the *Report of the Assembly of Poissy in 1561.*

LAC and M. SEGUIER; who gave their written opinions against ratifying and accrediting the same, and advised that, at all events, the Parliament should remonstrate with the King against validity being given to the Letters in question: the Jesuits, however, obtained a Mandate, by fraudulent means, for registering the Letters Patent *.

Shortly after, the University agreed to petition the King that the Bull of PAUL III. might not be inserted in the Registers of the Parliament; and the Parliament referred the consideration of the subject to the Bishop of Paris, and to the Dean and Faculty of Theology of that City and University, in order to a proper conclusion being formed upon it.

EUSTACHE DU BELLAY, Bishop of Paris, after observing, that the Bulls of PAUL III. and of JULIUS III. had been communicated to him by order of Parliament, does not hesitate to pronounce that “*those Bulls contained many things which appeared to him utterly contrary to reason, and such as ought not to be tolerated or received in the Christian religion.*” He calls the title of the Society, “*an arrogant name, as if they would represent themselves as alone constituting the Church;*” affirms that, “*in spite of their vow of poverty, they held and disposed of Ecclesiastical dignities: that they would not be corrected by Bishops; that they usurped the rights of those who have the cure of souls; and the rights of Bishops, and even of the Pope himself, whom they specially vowed to obey, and to go wherever he should send them; while their Superior might retain those whom the Pope should send; and that they had obtained exemption from joining in the public service.*” The Bishop of Paris concludes in these terms: “*Finally, let the Parliament consider that all innovations are dangerous; and that from these, many unforeseen and unexpected dangers must arise.*”

* See the *Memorial of M. Seguier to the Parliament*, presented 26th January, 1552.

With regard to the opinion of the Faculty of Theology: after a discussion which lasted several months, the Faculty, on the 1st December, 1554, came to that celebrated decision which has been so often cited *: “This new Society” (say they) “appropriates particularly to itself the unusual title of the “name of Jesus, receives with the greatest laxity, and with-“out any discrimination, all kinds of persons, however cri-“minal, lawless, and infamous they may be—it withdraws “from the obedience and submission due to Ordinaries—un-“justly deprives both temporal and spiritual Lords of their “rights—brings disturbance into every form of government, “—and occasions many subjects of complaint, many law-suits, “contentions, jealousies, and schisms, among the people. “*The Society, therefore, appears to us to be dangerous in all that concerns the faith, calculated to disturb the peace of the Church, to overturn the Monastic Order, and more fit to destroy than to build up.*”

When we call to mind the universal disorder which the Jesuits have occasioned throughout the world; their multiplied crimes; the pertinacity with which, for more than two hundred years, they have resisted all authority, both spiritual and temporal; sought to ruin all other bodies in succession; attempted the lives of Princes, and of all others who were regarded as unfriendly to them; their flagrant errors upon all points of theology; the dangerous maxims in morals which they have either fathered or countenanced; must we not recognise in the judgment thus formed of them, even from their origin, by the Faculty of Theology, a prophecy too precisely verified?

The opinions of the Bishop of Paris, and of the Faculty of Theology, operated as an ordeal to the Jesuits. They admit† that opposition arose in every quarter; that the Preachers did not spare them in the pulpit; that the Clergy

* See *M. d'Argentré, Collect. Jud.* Vol. ii. p. 192.

† *Life of Ignatius*, by BOUHOURS.

loudly attacked the Institution ; and that the Professors made them the subjects of their lectures.

The Bishop of Paris, thus supported by the suffrages of his whole diocese, interdicted them from all their functions * ; and this example of EUSTACHE DU BELLAY was followed by all the Prelates who were then at Paris ; but, in defiance of the Bishop, the Jesuits, as intractable then as since, retired into the Quarter of St. Germain, where they pretended they were exempt from his jurisdiction †, and where they continued to exercise their functions in spite of the interdict.

IGNATIUS, who was still alive, exhorted his disciples to expect every thing from time, and not to be discouraged (a maxim of which they have since made abundant use ‡) ; and, in order to console them, he obtained FROM THE INQUISITION OF SPAIN a Decree, censuring the opinion of the Faculty : the Jesuits, however, did not dare, for many years, to shew themselves in France. Before their re-appearance there in 1560 is noticed, a few facts concerning them may be related.

CHAP. III.

DIFFERENT EVENTS RELATING TO THE JESUITS BETWEEN THE YEARS 1554 AND 1560.

IT is not alone in France that so unfavorable an opinion was formed of the rising Society : GEORGE BRONSWELL, the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in 1558, prophesied of them as follows :

“ There is a fraternity which has lately arisen, called “ the Jesuits, who will seduce many ; who acting, for the “ most part, like the Scribes and Pharisees, will strive to “ overturn the truth : they will go near to accomplish their

* *Continuation of Fleury*, Vol. xxx. lib. 150.

† *History of Paris*, lib. 21.

‡ PASQUIER’S *Catechism of the Jesuits*, lib. iii. chap. 40.

“ object, for they transform themselves into various shapes :
 “ among Pagans, they will be Pagans ; among Atheists,
 “ Atheists ; Jews among Jews ; and Reformers among Re-
 “ formers, for the sole purpose of discovering your intentions,
 “ your hearts, and desires. These persons are spread over
 “ the whole earth : they will be admitted into the Councils of
 “ Princes, which will, however, be no wiser from their intro-
 “ duction : they will infatuate them so far as to induce them to
 “ reveal the greatest secrets of their hearts : they will be in
 “ no way aware of them. This will be the consequence of
 “ their advisers neglecting to observe the laws of God and of
 “ his Gospel, and conniving at the sins of Princes. Not-
 “withstanding, God will, in the end, in order to avenge his
 “ law, cut off this Society even by those who have most sup-
 “ ported and employed it ; so that, at last, they will become
 “ odious to all nations *.”

It was in Portugal that these Fathers formed their first establishment : before even the Bull of 1540, which confirmed their institution, had been granted to them, the ambassador MASCARENHAS had carried with him into Portugal, FRANCIS XAVIER and RODRIGUEZ. While XAVIER, full of zeal, crossed the seas to convert the Infidels, the Patriarch IGNATIUS did not omit to send many of his companions into Portugal, who knew how to make their way at Court. They obtained permission that the Schools should be confided to them †.

The University of Coimbra opposed, in a body, the order which it received in 1555 (fifteen years after the introduction of the Jesuits in Portugal) to deliver up to them the College of Philosophy. At the congress of the deputies of all the cities in the Kingdom convoked by King SEBASTIAN in 1562, the people presented the strongest remonstrances against the

* See VARAN'S *Annals of Ireland*, reprinted at Dublin in 1705.

† See the *Manifesto of the King of Portugal* of the 28th June, 1759, by which he abolishes their Schools, declaring that Learning itself had sensibly declined under them.

great wealth which these Professors had already acquired (since the twenty-two years which they had been in the kingdom), and against the system of education pursued by them. The nobility and people of Oporto met together on 22d November, 1630, to deliberate upon the Schools opened by them in that year, and enacted severe penalties against all who should go there, or send their children there.

War having arisen between France and CHARLES V. some of the Jesuits were compelled to quit Paris: they retired, with DOMANA their superior, who took them to finish their studies at Louvain: thence they spread themselves over Flanders with some proselytes: having been there some time without any fixed residence, they influenced some Magistrates of Tournay, who took pains to procure them a College *.

New intrigues followed on the part of the Jesuits: IGNATIUS procured a Letter from Cardinal CARPI to the Nuncio of Brussels, to maintain the privileges of the Jesuits; he obtained also the recommendation of the Queen of Spain.

Their expulsion from Sarragossa took place in 1555 †: they had obtained a House there, while waiting for the building of their College; but finding they had not room enough, they seized upon a piece of land which belonged to the Augustines, on which they erected their Church. Those monks complained of the encroachment, and caused notice to be given to the Jesuits not to continue that building: but the Jesuits availing themselves of their privilege, which authorizes them to build wherever they may think proper, accused the Augustines of disobedience to the Holy See, and continued their building. When it was finished, without applying to the Ordinary, they put in force another of their privileges, which enables them to consecrate their own Churches, and they said Mass in their new Chapel.

The Archbishop of Sarragossa's Grand Vicar sent to pro-

* See *L'Histoire des Religieux de la Comp. de Jesus*, lib. iii. ch. 58.

† See *Continuation of Fleury*, Vol. xxxi. lib. 151.

hibit them from proceeding any farther; but they paid no attention to the admonition, which obliged the Grand Vicar to forbid all persons, on pain of excommunication, from going to hear Mass among them, or taking part in any sacred service: he caused the Decree to be affixed at the door of their Church, and directed all preachers to publish it from their pulpits.

The Jesuits persisting in celebrating divine service, notwithstanding these proceedings, and in spite of the prohibitions, the Grand Vicar excommunicated them, as well as all who had assisted at it; and in order to oblige these Fathers to quit the city, he placed them under an interdict until they should depart: they quitted the city; but found, at length, the means of returning; for which purpose, they obtained a Letter from Queen JANE the mother of CHARLES V.*

Their credit at the Court of Spain was already so great, that, as has been observed, they interfered in the marriage of PHILIP II. They produce a copy of the Letters Patent, which they pretend to have obtained from that Prince for their establishment in the Low Countries, dated in August, 1556, the authenticity of which was attacked by M. GREBERT.—See *Réponse de M. GREBERT*, p. 12.

The Author of *L'Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus* gives a detail† (on the authority of ORLANDIN the Jesuit) of what passed in the Low Countries in 1556, respecting the Jesuits. IGNATIUS long laboured to procure for his Society an establishment in Flanders: he sent RIRADENEIRA to Antwerp, where PHILIP II. then kept his Court; the doctrines of LUTHER, which began to spread themselves in the environs, afforded this Father a pretext for offering to that Prince, the services of his Company: he laid before him the advantages which it had rendered to the Church, wherever it had possessed Establishments, adding, that it would be of equal benefit in the Low Countries, where it was so much

* *Continuation of Fleury*, Vol. xxxi. lib. 151.

† *Ibid.* lib. 3. p. 76 et seq.

the more necessary from HERESY having begun to spread ; that they only asked, in order to check its progress, such revenues as might give solidity to their Establishments ; in short, that this Monarch would, “ by his compliance, perform an action “ worthy of his great mind, agreeable to the whole Church, and “ to Religion in general.”

The King contented himself with requiring of the Jesuits their request in writing, which he sent to the Council of Flanders : as soon as it was communicated to them, the Bishops, Rectors, Magistrates, Religious Orders, and even the People, declared unanimously against their Establishment. The disturbances they had already excited in Tournay, and Sarragossa, were the general theme of conversation ; and the indignation against them was universal.

The Magistrates contending, amongst others, that the privileges of the Jesuits would overturn the rights of Bishops, and of the other religious Orders, the Jesuit RIBADENEIRA maintained, that “ those privileges could not be attacked without attacking the omnipotence of Jesus Christ ; because Jesus Christ having bequeathed that to the Pope, it was a crying injustice to wish to annul, rectify, or alter what the Sovereign Pontiffs had once settled.” This extraordinary position had no weight with the Council of Flanders, and the Jesuits were at that time sent back.

The afflictions which followed their early disgraces in France, Flanders, Sarragossa, and Spain, were alleviated by the magnificent establishments, which their industrious Patriarch was enabled to procure for them at Rome *.

This Professor of poverty, by the contributions which he drew from different persons, accomplished the erection of the two superb Roman and German Colleges, and a very agreeable and commodious country-house, for the advantage of the air. These Establishments, which have been since enlarged and multiplied, have furnished the Jesuits with the means

* *Continuation of Fleury*, Vol. xxxi. lib. 151.

of accommodating about six hundred of their members at Rome, and of presiding from thence over the world at large.

IGNATIUS, the main spring of this great body, died on the 31st of July, 1556, having the satisfaction of seeing his company so increased that it was already divided into twelve Provinces, and possessed at least a hundred Colleges, without including its other Houses.

LAINEZ, the oldest of IGNATIUS's companions, a subtle character, and one who appeared to have had the greatest share in all the operations of IGNATIUS, caused a General Assembly to be convened for the election of a General; and, in the mean time, he succeeded in obtaining for himself the appointment of Vicar General to govern during the interregnum.

As soon as the Députies appeared at the General Assembly, that skilful Politician made them sign a kind of Formulary, the principal article of which was, that no other business should be proceeded on by the Chapter, until a General should be elected.

Pope PAUL IV. having seen, however, with jealousy, that the authority of the General of this Order over his subjects was parallel with his own, had appointed Cardinal PACHECO to represent him at the Chapter, and to signify to it his determination; which was, first, that the Generalship should not be perpetual, but only for three years, as in many other Orders; and secondly, that the Jesuits should join in the public service of the Church, as was practised by other Orders.

With a view to get rid of both these conditions, the Jesuits represented that they were unable to discuss any subject until the election of a General had taken place: they were therefore suffered to proceed to it, and on the 2d of July, 1558, the choice fell upon LAINEZ.

The election being once decided, no respect whatever was paid to the two demands of the Pope: he was much incensed at this; and when the new General came with many of his Order to announce the election to PAUL IV. he treated them

as rebellious subjects, and fomenters of heresy, on the ground of their refusal to celebrate Divine Service in common. He also declared to them, that he objected to the Generalship continuing more than three years.

Notwithstanding this decision and the formal notice which was given to them on the part of the Pope, by Cardinal TRANI, the Jesuits passed a Decree, on the 24th of August, 1558, pronouncing that the Generalship should be perpetual; and on the 25th they presented a Memorial to the Pope*, in which they observe that they could not avoid declaring that *it was more advantageous for the Society that the General should not be changed during his life: we are, however, they added, obedient children, and quite ready to observe what your Holiness shall command.* Their only object in these specious professions, was to amuse PAUL IV. who was sufficiently advanced in life to lead them to hope that he would never see the end of the first three years. They were not mistaken; the Pope died shortly after, and the Generalship has remained perpetual ever since.

With respect to the service in common, far from conforming to what the Pope required of them, they passed in that Congregation a positive Decree against it.

Such was, from the beginning, the subtlety of these Fathers, and it has only increased from that time: but the profound views of LAINEZ are best discovered; in his having, so far back as in 1558, laid those foundations upon which the Jesuits, in order to gain the affections of all men, and to secure to themselves the direction of the most tender consciences, have in the end erected an edifice of the most monstrous errors of every kind.

It appears from the History of the Council of Trent †, that LAINEZ, on the 20th of October, 1562, made an address of two hours long for the purpose of attacking the Episcopal

* See the *Decree and Memorial* in the *Réceuil des Décrets de la première Congrégation*, p. 44, Edit. 1635.

† See Father PAUL's History, 1562.

authority openly, and of concentrating all authority in the sole person of the Pope. This address, which was full of violence, shocked the Bishops: EUSTACHE DU BELLAY, the Bishop of Paris, who was prevented from attending by illness, complained strongly of what LAINEZ was reported to have advanced. “At present” (said he *), “a Society a few days old, which, in the opinion of the University of Paris, is neither secular nor regular, and which appears to have shewn itself for the invention of novelties in the Faith, for disturbing the repose of the Church, and for destroying the whole Monastic system, endeavours to abolish the Episcopal jurisdiction altogether, in making it precarious, and of human authority.”

In the Sitting of the 16th of June, 1563, LAINEZ openly defended the abuses of the Court of Rome, which it was wished to reform. He said †, that “*the Disciple not being above his Master, nor the Servant above his Lord, it followed that the Council had no authority to interfere in this reform.*” He was interested in defending the greatest abuses of Dispensations and Indulgences, without which the Society itself could not exist. In the same Sitting he contended that “*Christ having power to dispense from every law, the Pope his Vicar had the same.*” HERVET wrote from the Council that “*the Jesuits had from their origin resolved to flatter the vices of the Roman Pontiffs ‡.*”

* See Father PAUL’s History, An. 1562, 20 October.

† See Father PAUL, on that day’s meeting.

‡ See *Mercure Jesuitique*, Vol. iii.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY



0035518626

04309123

932•5
P87 V1

